arXiv:1704.04674v1 [math.PR] 15 Apr 2017

LIMIT THEOREMS FOR MONOCHROMATIC 2-STARS AND TRIANGLES

BHASWAR B. BHATTACHARYA AND SUMIT MUKHERJEE

Abstract. In this paper we study the asymptotic limiting distribution of the number of monochromatic 2-stars and triangles in a growing sequence of graphs where the vertices are colored independently and uniformly at random. We show that the asymptotic distribution of the number of monochromatic 2-stars for any graph sequence is a sum of mutually independent components, each term of which is a polynomial of a single Poisson random variable of degree 1 or 2. Moreover, any limiting distribution for the number of monochromatic 2-stars has a representation of this form.

The number of monochromatic triangles is more challenging to characterize; in this case, the limiting distributions can involve products and mixtures of Poisson random variables. We derive conditions under which the number of monochromatic triangles is asymptotically Poisson. As a consequence, an interesting second-moment phenomenon emerges: the number of monochromatic 2-stars or triangles converges to a Poisson distribution whenever the limits of their corresponding mean and the variance are equal.

1. Introduction

Let G_n be a simple labelled undirected graph with vertex set $V(G_n) := \{1, 2, \cdots, |V(G_n)|\}$, edge set $E(G_n)$, and adjacency matrix $A(G_n) = \{a_{ij}(G_n), i, j \in V(G_n)\}$. In a *uniformly random c_n-coloring of G_n*, the vertices of G_n are colored with c_n colors as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(v \in V(G_n) \text{ is colored with color } a \in \{1, 2, \ldots, c_n\}) = \frac{1}{c_n}, \tag{1.1}$$

independent from the other vertices. An edge $(a, b) \in E(G_n)$ is said to be *monochromatic* if $X_a = X_b$, where X_v denotes the color of the vertex $v \in V(G_n)$ in a uniformly random c_n-coloring of G_n. Denote by

$$T(K_2, G_n) = \sum_{1 \le u < v \le |V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n) \mathbf{1}\{X_u = X_v\}, \tag{1.2}$$

the number of monochromatic edges in G_n.

The statistic (1.2) arises in several contexts, for example, as the Hamiltonian of the Ising/Potts models on G_n [6], and in non-parametric two-sample tests [21]. Moreover, the asymptotics of $T(K_2, G_n)$ is often useful in the study of coincidences [15] as a generalization of the birthday paradox [5, 13, 14, 15]: If G_n is a friendship-network graph colored uniformly with $c_n = 365$ colors (corresponding to birthdays), then two friends will have the same birthday whenever the corresponding edge in the graph G_n is monochromatic.[1] Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n) > 0)$ is the probability that there are two friends with the same birthday. Note that $\mathbb{P}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n) > 0) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n) = 0) = 1 - \chi_{G_n}(c_n)/c_n^{|V(G_n)|}$, where $\chi_{G_n}(c_n)$ counts the number of proper colorings

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C15, 60C05, 60F05, 05D99.

Key words and phrases. Combinatorial probability, Extremal combinatorics, Graph coloring, Limit theorems.

[1] When the underlying graph $G_n = K_n$ is the complete graph K_n on n vertices, this reduces to the classical birthday problem.

of G_n using c_n colors. The function χ_{G_n} is known as the *chromatic polynomial* of G_n, and is a central object in graph theory [16, 22, 23].

It is well-known that the limiting distribution of $T(K_2, G_n)$, exhibits a universality, that is, $T(K_2, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(\lambda)$, whenever $\mathbb{E}(T(K_2, G_n)) = \frac{|E(G_n)|}{c_n} \to \lambda$, *for any graph sequence* G_n. This was shown by Barbour et al. [5, Theorem 5.G], using the Stein's method for Poisson approximation, for any sequence of deterministic graphs. Recently, Bhattacharya et al. [7, Theorem 1.1] gave a new proof of this result based on the method of moments, which illustrates interesting connections to extremal combinatorics.

For a general graph H, define $T(H, G_n)$ to be the number of monochromatic copies of H in G_n, where the vertices of G_n are colored uniformly at random with c_n colors. Examples from [7] show that the Poisson universality phenomenon does not extend to general graphs H. For example, when $H = K_{1,2}$ is the 2-star, there are graphs $\{G_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ for which $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ converges to a quadratic in Poisson. Similarly, when $H = K_3$ is the triangle, there are graph $\{G_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ where $T(K_3, G_n)$ converges to a mixture of Poissons.

In this paper we provide the complete characterization of the limiting distribution of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$, and derive sufficient conditions under which the number of monochromatic triangles $T(K_3, G_n)$ converges to a Poisson distribution. These quantities arise as generalizations of the birthday problem, where, instead of pairs, we count the number of triple birthday matches among friends: for example, if the friendship-network G_n is colored uniformly at random with $c_n = 365$ colors, the existence of a monochromatic triangle is the event that three mutual friends have the same birthday. The limiting Poisson distribution of the number of triple-birthday matches in a complete graph has found many applications, for example, in the study of coincidences [15, Problem 3], and hash-function attacks in cryptology [27].

1.1. Limiting Distribution for Monochromatic 2-Stars.

Let G_n be a simple graph with vertex set $V(G_n)$ and edge set $E(G_n)$. For a fixed graph H, denote by $N(H, G_n)$ the number of isomorphic copies of H in G_n. Note that $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = \sum_{v\in V(G_n)} \binom{d_v}{2}$, where d_v is the degree of the vertex $v \in V(G_n)$.

Now, suppose G_n is colored with c_n colors as in (1.1). If X_v denotes the color of vertex $v \in V(G_n)$, then the number of monochromatic copies of $K_{1,2}$ in G_n is

$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) := \sum_{v=1}^{|V(G_n)|} \sum_{1\leq u<w\leq |V(G_n)|} a_{vu}(G_n)a_{vw}(G_n)\mathbf{1}\{X_v = X_u = X_w\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \frac{1}{c_n^2} N(K_{1,2}, G_n)$. The following proposition, which is proved in Appendix A.1, shows that the limiting behavior of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ is governed by its expectation:

Proposition 1.1. *Let $\{G_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence of deterministic graphs colored uniformly with c_n colors as in (1.1). Then*

$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{P} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = 0, \\ \infty & \text{if } \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the most interesting regime is where $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \Theta(1)$,[2] that is, $c_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}{c_n^2} = \frac{1}{c_n^2} \sum_{v \in V(G_n)} \binom{d_v}{2} = \Theta(1). \tag{1.4}$$

The following theorem completely characterizes the limiting distribution of the number of monochromatic $K_{1,2}$, for any sequence of graphs satisfying (1.4).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\{G_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence of deterministic graphs colored uniformly with c_n colors, as in (1.1).*

(1) *Assume $c_n \to \infty$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}{c_n^2} = \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N(K_3, G_n)}{c_n^2} = \nu. \tag{1.5}$$

Moreover, let $d_{(1)} \geq d_{(2)} \geq \dots d_{(|V(G_n)|)}$ be the degrees of the vertices in G_n arranged in non-increasing order, such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{d_{(v)}}{c_n} = \theta_v, \tag{1.6}$$

for each $v \in V(G_n)$ fixed. Then

$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \to \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \binom{R_v}{2} + 3Q_1 + Q_2, \tag{1.7}$$

where the convergence is in distribution and in all moments; $R_1, R_2, \dots$, and Q_1, Q_2 are independent, such that

- *$R_1, R_2, \dots$, are independent $\mathrm{Pois}(\theta_1), \mathrm{Pois}(\theta_2), \dots$, respectively;*
- *Q_1 is distributed as $\mathrm{Pois}(\nu)$;*
- *Q_2 is distributed as $\mathrm{Pois}\left(\lambda - 3\nu - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \theta_v^2\right)$.*

(2) *Conversely, if $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ converges in distribution, then the limit is necessarily of the form as in the RHS of (1.7), for some non-negative constants λ, $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \cdots$, and ν.*

Note that the limit in (1.7) above has two independent components:

- A *quadratic part* $\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \binom{R_v}{2}$ which corresponds to the number of monochromatic $K_{1,2}$ in G_n incident on vertices of "high" degree, that is, the vertices of degree $\Theta(c_n)$.
- An independent *linear part* $3Q_1 + Q_2$ which is the contribution of the vertices with "low" degree, that is, degree $o(c_n)$.

The proof of the theorem is based on a two-step moment comparison technique: The quadratic part appears from an independent edge approximation (Lemma 2.5), and the linear part from an independent triple approximation (Lemma 2.6). To compare the moments, we need estimates from extremal combinatorics which may be of independent interest (Lemma 2.7). The details are given in Section 2.

The limit in (1.7) simplifies when the graph G_n has no vertices of high degree. The following corollary is a consequence of Theorem 1.2. The proof is given in Section 2.8.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $\{G_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence of deterministic graphs. Then the following are equivalent.*

[2]For two non-negative sequences $(a_n)_{n\geq 1}$ and $(b_n)_{n\geq 1}$, $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$ means that there exist positive constants C_1, C_2, such that $C_1 b_n \leq a_n \leq C_2 b_n$, for all n large enough.

(a) Setting $\Delta(G_n) := \max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v$, *assume*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}{c_n^2} = \lambda, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N(K_3, G_n)}{c_n^2} = \nu, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\Delta(G_n)}{c_n} = 0.$$

(b) $T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} 3Q_1 + Q_2$, *where* $Q_1 \sim \text{Pois}(\nu)$ *and* $Q_2 \sim \text{Pois}\,(\lambda - 3\nu)$ *are independent.*

The above corollary further simplifies, when $N(K_3, G_n) = o(c_n^2)$, that is, if G_n has few triangles. In this case, $Q_1 = 0$ and $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ converges to a Poisson distribution. In fact, the condition

$$\frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}{c_n^2} \to \lambda, \quad N(K_3, G_n) = o(c_n^2), \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta(G_n) = \max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v = o(c_n),$$

is equivalent to the condition that $\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \to \lambda$ and $\text{Var}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) \to \lambda$, that is, the limiting Poisson distribution of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ is implied only by the convergence of its first two moments, exhibiting a *second-moment phenomenon.*

Corollary 1.4. *Let* G_n *be a sequence of deterministic graphs, colored as in* (1.1) *with* c_n *colors. Then* $T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ *if and only if* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n) = \lambda$ *and* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \text{Var}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \lambda$.

The proof of this corollary is given in Section 2.9. We will encounter the second-moment phenomenon again for the limiting Poisson distribution of the number of monochromatic triangles $T(K_3, G_n)$ (Corollary 1.6). It would be interesting to explore whether this phenomenon extends to $T(H, G_n)$, the number of monochromatic copies of H in a uniformly random coloring of G_n, for other graphs H. This would complement the well-known *fourth-moment phenomenon*, which asserts that the limiting normal distribution of certain homogeneous forms is implied by the convergence of the corresponding sequence of fourth moments (refer to Nourdin et al. [28, 29, 30] for general fourth-moment theorems and invariance principles, and Bhattacharya et al. [7, Theorem 1.3] for an example of this phenomenon in random graph coloring).

1.2. **Poisson Limit for Monochromatic Triangles.** As before, let G_n be colored with c_n colors as in (1.1), and X_v denote the color of the vertex $v \in [n]$. Then the number of monochromatic triangles in G_n is

$$T(K_3, G_n) := \sum_{1 \le u < v < w \le |V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n) a_{vw}(G_n) a_{uw}(G_n) \mathbf{1}\{X_u = X_v = X_w\}. \tag{1.8}$$

To state our result on the limiting Poisson distribution of $T(K_3, G_n)$, we need a few definitions:

Definition 1.1. For $s \ge 1$, denote by $\mathcal{D}_s = (V(\mathcal{D}_s), E(\mathcal{D}_s))$ the *s-pyramid*: $V(\mathcal{D}_s) = \{a, b, c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_s\}$ and

$$E(\mathcal{D}_s) = \{(a,b), (a,c_1), (a,c_2), \ldots (a,c_s), (b,c_1), (b,c_2), \ldots (b,c_s)\}.$$

Note that the 1-pyramid is the triangle ($\mathcal{D}_1 = K_3$) and the 2-pyramid $\mathcal{D}_2$ is the 4-cycle with a diagonal.

Moroever, for u and v in $V(G_n)$, define the *co-degree* of u and v by

$$T(u,v) := |\{w \in V(G_n) : (u,w), (v,w) \in E(G_n)\}|.$$

Note that

$$N(K_3, G_n) = \sum_{1 \le u < v \le |V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n) T(u,v), \quad \text{and} \quad N(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n) = \sum_{1 \le u < v \le |V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n) \binom{T(u,v)}{2}.$$

Now, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 1.5. *Let G_n be a sequence of deterministic graphs, colored as in (1.1) with c_n colors, such that the following conditions hold:*

(a) There exists $0 < \lambda < \infty$ such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{c_n^2}\sum_{1\le u<v<w\le|V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n)a_{vw}(G_n)a_{uw}(G_n)\mathbf{1}\{T(u,v),T(v,w),T(u,w)\le \varepsilon c_n\}=\lambda. \tag{1.9}$$

(b) For every $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{c_n}\sum_{1\le u<v\le|V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n)\mathbf{1}\{T(u,v)\ge \varepsilon c_n\}=0. \tag{1.10}$$

Then

$$T(K_3,G_n)\xrightarrow{D}\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda).$$

Note that c_n in the above theorem is chosen such that the conditions (1.9) and (1.10) hold. In this way we can capture the limiting distribution of $T(K_3,G_n)$ *even when moment convergence does not hold*. Thus, it is possible that $\mathbb{E}(T(K_3,G_n)) = \frac{N(K_3,G_n)}{c_n^2}$ diverges, but $T(K_3,G_n)$ still converges to a Poisson distribution, with mean given by (1.9) (see Example 8). This is in contrast with the situations for the number of monochromatic edges ([7, Theorem 1.1]) and the number of monochromatic $K_{1,2}$ (Theorem 1.2 above), where the convergence is in distribution as well as in moments. One of the strengths of the above theorem is that it captures the correct limiting distribution with an appropriate truncation, and gives a condition for the limiting Poisson distribution of $T(K_3,G_n)$, which is not captured by a direct moment-based argument.

Note that condition (1.10) essentially assumes that the number of pairs $(u,v)\in E(G_n)$ with large co-degree $T(u,v)$ is small. This truncation is necessary to include cases like Example 8, where the number of 2-pyramids is too large. Under the slightly stronger assumption that $N(\mathcal{D}_2,G_n)=o(c_n^3)$, we can get the following cleaner result, which is restated below in terms of the convergence of the first two moments of $T(K_3,G_n)$; an illustration of the second-moment phenomenon discussed above. Unlike Corollary 1.4, the converse to the following corollary does not hold (see Example 8).

Corollary 1.6. *Let G_n be a sequence of deterministic graphs, colored as in (1.1) with c_n colors, such that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}T(K_3,G_n)=\lambda$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{Var}(T(K_3,G_n))=\lambda$. Then $T(K_3,G_n)\xrightarrow{D}\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$.*

The proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.6 are given in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2, respectively. Applications of these results and examples of non-Poisson limiting distributions are discussed in Section 5.

1.3. **Related Work on Non-Uniform Coloring.** A natural generalization of the uniform coloring distribution (1.1) is to consider a general coloring distribution $\underline{p}=(p_1,p_2,\dots,p_c)$, that is, the probability a vertex is colored with color $a\in[c]$ is p_a independent from the colors of the other vertices, where $p_a\ge 0$, and $\sum_{a=1}^c p_a = 1$. Define $P_G(\underline{p})$ to be the probability that G is properly colored. $P_G(\underline{p})$ is related to Stanley's generalized chromatic polynomial [31], and under the uniform coloring distribution it is precisely the proportion of proper c-colorings of G. Recently, Fadnavis [18] proved that $P_G(\underline{p})$ is Schur-concave for every fixed c, whenever the graph G is claw-free, that is, when G has no induced $K_{1,3}$. This implies that for claw-free graphs, the probability that it is properly colored is maximized under the uniform distribution, that is, $p_a = 1/c$ for all $a\in[c]$.

Poisson limit theorems for the number of monochromatic subgraphs in a random coloring of a graph sequence G_n are applicable when the number of colors grows in an appropriate way compared

to the number of certain specific subgraphs in G_n. Arratia et al. [4] used Stein's method based on dependency graphs to prove Poisson approximation theorems for the number of monochromatic cliques in a uniform coloring of a complete graph (see also Chatterjee et al. [12]). Poisson limit theorems for the number of general monochromatic subgraphs in a random coloring of a graph sequence are also given in Cerquetti and Fortini [10]. They assumed that the distribution of colors is exchangeable and proved that the number of copies of any particular monochromatic subgraph converges in distribution to a mixture of Poissons.

However, most of these results need conditions on the number of certain subgraphs in G_n and the coloring distribution. On the other hand, under the uniform coloring distribution, using the method of moments, and estimates from extremal combinatorics, we are able to derive very precise results: the complete characterization of the limiting distribution for the number of monochromatic 2-stars, and capturing the limiting Poisson distribution for the number of monochromatic triangles.

1.4. **Organization.** The rest of the paper is organized as follows: The proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.4 are given in Section 2.1. Applications of these general results in various examples are discussed in Section 3. The proof of Theorem 1.5 is given in Section 4. Examples of this result and other constructions which give rise to non-Poisson limiting distributions are discussed in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6 we summarize our results and discuss future directions. The proofs of some general technical lemmas are given in the appendix.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we begin with an outline of the proof and the statement of main lemmas (Section 2.1). The relevant subgraph estimates from extremal combinatorics are proved in Section 2.2. The moment comparison lemmas are proved in Sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5. Finally, in Section 2.7, using these lemmas, the proof of Theorem 1.2 is completed. The proof of Corollary 1.4 is given in Section 2.9.

2.1. **Proof Outline.** To begin with, note that the number of 2-stars in G_n remains unchanged if all the isolated edges in G_n and the corresponding vertices are dropped. Hence, without loss of generality, we may assume that G_n does not contain isolated edges and isolated vertices. This reduction ensures that $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = \sum_{v\in V(G_n)} \binom{d_v}{2}$ is of the same order as $\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v^2$:

Observation 2.1. *If G_n has no isolated edges, assumption (1.4) implies $\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v^2 = \Theta(c_n^2)$.*

Proof. If G_n has no isolated edges, the following inequality holds:

$$|E(G_n)| \le \sum_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v \mathbf{1}\{d_v \ge 2\}. \tag{2.1}$$

To see (2.1), note that if an edge $(u, v) \in E(G_n)$ has $\min\{d_u, d_v\} \ge 2$, then that edge is counted twice in the RHS above, whereas an edge $(u, v) \in E(G_n)$ which has $d_u = 1$ and $d_v \ge 2$ is counted once in the RHS.

Therefore, $|E(G_n)| \le 2\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} \binom{d_v}{2} = \Theta(c_n)$. This along with (1.4) implies, $\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v^2 = 2\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} \binom{d_v}{2} + 2|E(G_n)| = \Theta(c_n^2)$. □

Throughout the rest of this section, we will thus assume, without loss of generality, that G_n has no isolated vertices/edges and, hence, (1.4) implies $\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v^2 = \Theta(c_n^2)$. This also implies that

$$\max_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v \le \sqrt{\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v^2} = \Theta(c_n).$$

In fact, using (1.4) it can be shown that there are not too many vertices $v \in V(G_n)$ with $d_v = \Theta(c_n)$. To this end, we have the following definition:

Definition 2.1. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. A vertex $v \in V(G_n)$ is said to be ε-*big* if $d_v \geq \varepsilon c_n$. Denote the subset of ε-big vertices by $V_\varepsilon(G_n)$.

The following lemma is an easy consequence of (1.4) and the above definition. Recall that for two nonnegative sequences $(a_n)_{n\geq 1}$ and $(b_n)_{n\geq 1}$, $a_n \lesssim b_n$ means $a_n = O(b_n)$, and $a_n \sim b_n$ means $a_n = (1 + o(1))b_n$.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume (1.4) holds. Then for n large enough, $|V_\varepsilon(G_n)| = |\{v : d_v \geq \varepsilon c_n\}| \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}$.*

Proof. Choose n large enough so that $\varepsilon c_n > 2$. By assumption (1.4),

$$c_n^2 \gtrsim N(K_{1,2}, G_n) \geq \sum_{v: d_v \geq \varepsilon c_n} \binom{d_v}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4}|\{v : d_v \geq \varepsilon c_n\}|\varepsilon^2 c_n^2,$$

where we use the fact that $2x(x-1) \geq x^2$ for all $x \geq 2$. □

Define $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ to be the subgraph of G_n obtained by removing the edges between the ε-big vertices. Denote by $T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})$ the number of monochromatic 2-stars in $G_{n,\varepsilon}$, that is,

$$T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}) := \sum_{v=1}^{|V(G_n)|} \sum_{1\leq u<w\leq |V(G_n)|} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}\{X_v = X_u = X_w\}. \tag{2.2}$$

The following lemma shows that removing the edges between the ε-big vertices of G_n does not change the number of monochromatic 2-stars in G_n, in the limit:

Lemma 2.2. *Assume (1.4) holds. Then for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \to \infty$,*

$$N(K_{1,2}, G_n) - N(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}) = o(c_n^2), \quad N(K_3, G_n) - N(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon}) = o(c_n^2).$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}|T(K_{1,2}, G_n) - T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})| \to 0.$$

Proof. For every vertex $u \in V_\varepsilon(G_n)$, the number of 2-stars with central vertex u that are in G_n, but not in $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ is at most $|V_\varepsilon(G_n)|d_u \lesssim c_n|V_\varepsilon(G_n)|$. Therefore, the number of 2-stars which are in G_n, but not in $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ is at most $O(c_n|V_\varepsilon(G_n)|^2)$. This implies, by Lemma 2.1, $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = N(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}) + o(c_n^2)$.

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}|T(K_{1,2}, G_n) - T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})| \lesssim \frac{1}{c_n^2}(c_n|V_\varepsilon(G_n)|^2) = \frac{1}{c_n}|V_\varepsilon(G_n)|^2 \to 0,$$

as $c_n \to \infty$.

Finally, since $N(K_3, G_n) - N(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon})$ counts the number of triangles in G_n which are not in $G_{n,\varepsilon}$, every such triangle must contain a vertex in $V_\varepsilon(G_n)$, and by the same argument as before the number of such triangles is bounded above by $O(c_n|V_\varepsilon(G_n)|^2) = O(c_n/\varepsilon^4) = o(c_n^2)$, as $n \to \infty$. □

We now decompose the graph $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ based on the degree of the vertices as follows:

– Let $G_{n,\varepsilon}^+$ be the sub-graph of $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ formed by the ε-big vertices and the edges incident on them. More formally, it has vertex set $V_\varepsilon(G_n) \bigcup N_{G_{n,\varepsilon}}(V_\varepsilon(G_n))$, where $N_{G_{n,\varepsilon}}(V_\varepsilon(G_n))$ is

neighborhood of $V_\varepsilon(G_n)$ in $G_{n,\varepsilon}$,[3] and edge set $\{(u,v) \in G_{n,\varepsilon} : v \in V_\varepsilon(G_n)\}$. Note that by construction $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ is a bipartite graph.

– Let $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$ denote the induced subgraph of $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ with vertex set $V(G_n)\backslash V_\varepsilon(G_n)$.

The decomposition of the graph $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ is illustrated in Figure 1. Note that $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ and $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$ have common vertices (the black vertices in Figure 1), but no common edges, and consequently no common 2-stars/triangles. This implies

$$T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}) = T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) + \Delta(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}),$$

where $T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ is the number of monochromatic 2-stars in $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$; and

$$T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) := \sum_{v \in V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{1 \le u < w \le |V(G_n)|} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}\{X_v = X_u = X_w\}, \tag{2.3}$$

counts the number of monochromatic 2-stars in $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ with central vertex in $V_\varepsilon(G_n)$;[4] and the remainder term

$$\Delta(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}) := \sum_{v \notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{u \in V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{w \in V(G_n)} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}\{X_v = X_u = X_w\}. \tag{2.4}$$



FIGURE 1. The decomposition of $G_{n,\varepsilon}$: The graph formed by the blue edges is $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ and the graph formed by the red edges is $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$. Note that the black vertices belong to both $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ and $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$.

The following lemma shows that the remainder term goes to zero in expectation, and therefore, in probability.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\Delta(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})$ be as defined above in (2.4). If (1.5) and (1.6) hold, then we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}(\Delta(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})) = 0.$$

[3]For a graph $H = (V(H), E(H))$ and $S \subseteq V(H)$, the *neighborhood* of S in H is $N_H(S) = \{v \in V(H) : \exists\ u \in S \text{ such that } (u,v) \in E(H)\}$.

[4]Note that $T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ is not the number of 2-stars in $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$: It does not include the 2-stars in $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ with central vertex in $N_{G_{n,\varepsilon}}(V_\varepsilon(G_n))$ (the black vertices in Figure 1). Instead, these 2-stars are included in the remainder term $\Delta(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})$.

Proof. Note that for $v \notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)$ we have $\sum_{w\in V(G_n)} a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) = d_v \le \varepsilon c_n$. Moreover $\sum_{v\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) \le d_u$. Then, any $M > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\Delta(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})) \le \frac{\varepsilon c_n}{c_n^2} \sum_{u\in V_\varepsilon(G_n)} d_u =& \frac{\varepsilon}{c_n} \sum_{u:\varepsilon c_n \le d_u < M\varepsilon c_n} d_u + \frac{\varepsilon}{c_n} \sum_{u: d_u \ge M\varepsilon c_n} d_u \\ \le& \frac{1}{c_n^2} \sum_{u: d_u \le M\varepsilon c_n} d_u + \frac{1}{Mc_n^2} \sum_{u\in V(G_n)} d_u^2\end{aligned}$$

Since Observation 2.1 gives $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{c_n^2} \sum_{u\in V(G_n)} d_u^2 < \infty$, the second term in the RHS above converges to 0 on letting $n \to \infty$ followed by $M \to \infty$. Moreover, Lemma 2.1 implies that the number of terms in the first sum depends only on ε, and not on n. Thus, letting $n \to \infty$, the first sum above is bounded above by $\sum_{u=1}^{\infty} \theta_u^2 \mathbf{1}\{\theta_u \le M\varepsilon\}$, which converges to 0 on letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, by using DCT along with the fact that $\sum_{u=1}^{\infty} \theta_u^2 \le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{c_n^2} \sum_{u\in V(G_n)} d_u^2 < \infty$ (by Fatou's lemma). □

Combining Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}T(K_{1,2}, G_n) =& T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}) + o_P(1) \\ =& T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+) + T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-) + o_P(1). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Therefore, the limiting distribution of the $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ is the same as that of $T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+) + T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)$.

We begin by showing that $T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$ and $T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)$ are asymptotically independent in the moments, that is, the joint moments of $T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$ and $T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)$ factorize in the limit. This is shown in the following lemma, which is proved later in Section 2.3.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume (1.4) holds. Then for every non-negative integers r and s,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}\left(T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^r T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)^s\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^r\right) \mathbb{E}\left(T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)^s\right) \right| = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

Next, the distribution of random variables $T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$ is derived using a moment comparison technique: The following lemma (proof in Section 2.4) shows that the moments of $T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$ and $W_1(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$ are asymptotically close, where

$$W_1(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+) = \sum_{v\in V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{1\le u<w\le |V(G_n)|} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) Y_{vu} Y_{vw}, \tag{2.7}$$

for $\{Y_{uv}, (u,v) \in E(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)\}$ a collection of i.i.d. Bin($\frac{1}{c_n}$) random variables. Note that $W_1(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$ is an 'independent edge-approximation' of $T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$, obtained by replacing $\{\mathbf{1}\{X_u = X_v\}\}_{(u,v)\in E(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)}$, the indicator variables which encode whether the edges are monochromatic, by independent Bernoulli random variables.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $W_1(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$ be as defined above in (2.7). Then, for any integer $s \ge 1$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |\mathbb{E}T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s - \mathbb{E}W_1(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s| = 0,$$

whenever (1.4) holds. Moreover, for n large enough, there is a constant $C := C(s)$, such that $\mathbb{E}T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s \le C$.

To analyze $T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ we use the 'independent triple approximation', where the indictors $\mathbf{1}\{X_u = X_v = X_w\}$ are replaced by independent Bernoulli variables, for every triple of vertices in $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$. To this end, define

$$W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{v \notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{\substack{u<w \\ u,w \notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)}} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) Z_{uvw}, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\{Z_{uvw}, v < u < w \notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)\}$ is a collection of i.i.d. $\text{Bin}(1, \frac{1}{c_n^2})$ random variables, and if v, u, v are not in increasing order define $Z_{uvw} = Z_{\sigma(u)\sigma(v)\sigma(w)}$, where $\sigma(v) < \sigma(u) < \sigma(w)$ is the monotone rearrangement of u, w, v. Moreover, this collection is independent of the collection $\{Y_{uv}, (u, v) \in E(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})\}$ in Lemma 2.23. The following lemma (proof in Section 2.5) shows that the moments of $T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_2(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ are asymptotically close.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ be as defined above in (2.8). Then, for any $s \geq 1$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{n \to \infty} |\mathbb{E} T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^s - \mathbb{E} W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^s| = 0, \tag{2.9}$$

whenever (1.4) holds. Moreover, for n large enough, there is a constant $C := C(s)$, such that $\mathbb{E} T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^s \leq C$.

In Section 2.7, using the above results, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 as follows: Combining the above lemmas, it follows that the moments of $T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ are asymptotically close (Lemma 2.11). Then it remains to derive the limiting distribution of $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ (Lemma 2.12), and verifying moment identifiability conditions (Proposition A.1).

2.2. **Subgraph Estimates.** In this section we collect the different estimates on subgraph counts, required in the proof of Theorem 1.2. The combinatorial quantity that shows up in the moment computations, in the proof of Theorem 1.2, is $N(H, G_n)$, the number of isomorphic copies of a graph H in the graph G_n. To derive the limiting distribution of the number of monochromatic edges [7], we used classical results from extremal graph theory [2, 3, 17, 20], which bounds $N(H, G_n)$ in terms of $|E(G_n)|$. However, for the number of monochromatic $K_{1,2}$, we need bounds on $N(H, G_n)$ in terms of $N(K_{1,2}, G_n)$, which are more complicated and only known in very special cases.

In the following lemma we derive a bound on $N(P_4, G_n)$, where P_4 is the path of length 3 (with 4 vertices and 3 edges), in terms of $N(K_{1,2}, G_n)$, a result which may be of independent interest. The version of this bound for homomorphisms follows from the results of Kopparty and Rossman [24].

Lemma 2.7. *For any graph G_n,*

$$N(P_4, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{4/3}.$$

Proof. Recall that d_v is the degree of the vertex $v \in V(G_n)$. Also, note that

$$2N(P_4, G_n) \leq \sum_{u \in V(G_n)} \sum_{v \in V(G_n)} A_{uv}(G_n)(d_u - A_{uv}(G_n))(d_v - A_{uv}(G_n)).$$

Now, for any $\delta > 0$, let $I(\delta) := \{v \in V(G_n) : d_v \leq \delta \sqrt{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}\}$. Depending on whether $u, v \in I(\delta)$, consider the different cases:

Case **1:** If $u \in I(\delta)$,

$$\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} \sum_{u\in I(\delta)} (d_u - A_{uv}(G_n))(d_v - A_{uv}(G_n))A_{uv}(G_n)$$
$$\leq \delta\sqrt{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)} \sum_{u\in V(G_n)} \sum_{v\in V(G_n)} A_{uv}(G_n)(d_v - A_{uv}(G_n))$$
$$= 2\delta N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{3/2} \tag{2.10}$$

Case **2:** If $v \in I(\delta)$, similarly as before,

$$\sum_{v\in I(\delta)} \sum_{u\in V(G_n)} (d_v - A_{uv}(G_n))(d_u - A_{uv}(G_n))A_{uv}(G_n)$$
$$\leq \delta\sqrt{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)} \sum_{u\in V(G_n)} \sum_{v\in V(G_n)} A_{uv}(d_u - A_{uv})$$
$$= 2\delta N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{3/2}. \tag{2.11}$$

Case **3:** If $u, v \in I(\delta)^c$, then

$$\sum_{u,v\in I(\delta)^c} (d_u - A_{uv}(G_n))(d_v - A_{uv}(G_n))A_{uv}(G_n)$$
$$\leq \sum_{u,v\in I(\delta)^c} d_u d_v A_{uv}(G_n)$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{\delta^2 N(K_{1,2}, G_n)} \sum_{u,v\in I(\delta)^c} d_u^2 d_v^2 \leq \frac{16}{\delta^2} N(K_{1,2}, G_n), \tag{2.12}$$

when $\delta\sqrt{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)} \geq 2$, where we use the inequality $4\binom{d_u}{2} \geq d_u^2$ if $d_u \geq 2$.

Thus, adding together (2.10), (2.11), and (2.12), for any $\delta\sqrt{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)} \geq 2$ we have

$$N(P_4, G_n) \leq 2\delta N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{3/2} + \frac{8}{\delta^2} N(K_{1,2}, G_n).$$

If $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) \geq 8$, on choosing $\delta = N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{-1/6}$ gives the bound $N(P_4, G_n) \leq 10N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{4/3}$, which is our desired bound. If $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) < 8$ the bound holds trivially, and so the proof is complete. □

We will use the following simple characterizations of graphs without any P_4.

Observation 2.2. *If H is a connected graph with at least three vertices and no path of length 3, then H is either a star graph or a triangle.*

Proof. As H is a connected graph with at least three vertices, there exists $a \in V(H)$ such that degree of a is at least 2. Let $b, c \in V(H)$ be two neighbors of the vertex a. Then (a, b) and (a, c) form a 2-star. If there is no other vertex in H, then depending on whether the edge (b, c) is present or not H is a triangle or a 2-star.

Otherwise, $V(H)\backslash\{a, b, c\}$ is non-empty. If any vertex $d \in V(H)\backslash\{a, b, c\}$ is such that $(b, d) \in E(H)$ or $(c, d) \in E(H)$, then H will have a P_4. Then, it follows that every other vertex $d \in V(H)\backslash\{a, b, c\}$ must be connected to the vertex a, and also, no two vertices of $V(H)\backslash\{a, b, c\}$ can be connected. This shows that H is a star graph. □

Using this observation and Lemma 2.7 above, $N(H, G_n)$ can be bounded in terms of $N(K_{1,2}, G_n)$, for a general graph H.

Lemma 2.8. *Let H be a graph with at least three vertices in each connected component. Then for any graph G_n*

$$N(H, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\frac{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}{2}}, \tag{2.13}$$

where $\nu(H)$ is the number of connected components of H. Further,

$$N(H, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\gamma(H)} \text{ for some } \gamma(H) < \frac{|V(H)| - \nu(H)}{2}, \tag{2.14}$$

unless each component of H is a star graph or a triangle.

Proof. To begin with assume that H is connected. If H has exactly three vertices, then H is either a 2-star or a triangle, and

$$N(H, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\frac{|V(H)|-1}{2}},$$

and (2.13) holds.

If H is connected, and more than three vertices, then H contains a $K_{1,2}$ as a subgraph. This implies

$$N(H, G_n) \le N(K_{1,2}, G_n) \left(\max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v \right)^{|V(H)|-3}.$$

Now, since $\max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v = O(\sqrt{N(K_{1,2}, G)})$ we have

$$N(H, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G)^{\frac{|V(H)|-1}{2}}, \tag{2.15}$$

which shows (2.13) when the graph H is connected.

Finally, if H is not connected, then let $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{\nu(H)}$ be the connected components of H. Applying (2.15) to each component gives

$$N(H, G_n) \le \prod_{a=1}^{\nu(H)} N(H_a, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\sum_{a=1}^{\nu(H)} \frac{|V(H_a)|-1}{2}} = N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\frac{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}{2}},$$

completing the proof of (2.13).

To show (2.14), first assume that H is connected, and is not a star graph or a triangle. Then H must have at least 4 vertices, and by Observation 2.2, H has a path of length 3, and

$$\begin{aligned} N(H, G_n) &\le N(P_4, G_n) \left(\max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v \right)^{|V(H)|-4} \\ &\lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\frac{4}{3}} \cdot N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\frac{|V(H)|-4}{2}} \\ &= N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\gamma(H)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

where $\gamma(H) := \frac{4}{3} + \frac{|V(H)|-4}{2} = \frac{|V(H)|}{2} - \frac{2}{3} < \frac{|V(H)|-1}{2}$, proving (2.14) when H is connected, and is not a star graph or a triangle.

Finally, suppose H has connected components $H_1, H_2, \cdots, H_{\nu(H)}$, and some component, say H_1, is not a star graph or a triangle. Then using the bound $N(H_1, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G)^{\frac{|V(H_1)|}{2} - \frac{2}{3}}$ from

(2.16), and the bound $N(H_a, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G)^{\frac{|V(H_a)|-1}{2}}$ from (2.15), for the other components $a \in [2, \nu(H)]$, gives the estimate

$$N(H, G_n) \le \prod_{a=1}^{\nu(H)} N(H_a, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{2}{3}} \cdot N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\sum_{a=1}^{\nu(H)} \frac{|V(H_a)|-1}{2}} = N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\gamma(H)},$$

where $\gamma(H) = \frac{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} < \frac{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}{2}$, completing the proof of (2.14). □

2.3. **Proof of Lemma 2.4.** For any labeled subgraph H of G_n, define

$$\beta(H) := \mathbb{E} \prod_{(u,v)\in E(H)} \mathbf{1}\{X_u = X_v\} = \left(\frac{1}{c_n}\right)^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}, \tag{2.17}$$

where $\nu(H)$ is the number of connected components of H. Note that the definition of $\beta(\cdot)$ is free of the labelling of H, and so, it extends to unlabelled graphs as well. Thus, without loss of generality, we will define $\beta(H)$ as in (2.17), for an unlabelled graph H as well.

Let $H_1 = (V(H_1), E(H_1))$ and $H_2 = (V(H_2), E(H_2))$ be two (labelled) subgraphs of G_n, that is, $V(H_1)$ and $V(H_2)$ are subsets of $V(G_n)$, which inherits the labelling by induced by $V(G_n)$, and $E(H_1)$ and $E(H_2)$ are subsets of $E(H)$. Let $H_1 \bigcup H_2 = (V(H_1) \bigcup V(H_2), E(H_1) \bigcup E(H_2))$.

Lemma 2.9. *For any two finite graphs H_1 and H_2, $\beta(H_1 \bigcup H_2) \ge \beta(H_1)\beta(H_2)$, where $\beta(\cdot)$ is defined above in (2.17).*

Proof. Denote by $F = H_1 \bigcup H_2$, and let $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_{\nu(F)}$ be the connected components of F. Define

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \{s \in [\nu(F)] : V(F_s) \cap V(H_1) \neq \varnothing \text{ and } V(F_s) \cap V(H_2) = \varnothing\}, \\ I_2 &= \{s \in [\nu(F)] : V(F_s) \cap V(H_1) = \varnothing \text{ and } V(F_s) \cap V(H_2) \neq \varnothing\}, \\ I_{12} &= \{s \in [\nu(F)] : V(F_s) \cap V(H_1) \neq \varnothing \text{ and } V(F_s) \cap V(H_2) \neq \varnothing\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Fix $s \in I_{12}$, that is, $V(F_s) \cap V(H_1) \neq \varnothing$ and $V(F_s) \cap V(H_2) \neq \varnothing$. Then $F_s = F_s' \bigcup F_s''$, where

$$F_s' = (V(F_s) \cap V(H_1), E(F_s) \cap E(H_1)), \quad \text{and} \quad F_s'' = (V(F_s) \cap V(H_2), E(F_s) \cap E(H_2)).$$

Let $F_{s1}', F_{s2}' \ldots F_{sa}'$ be the connected components of F_s' and similarly, $F_{s1}'', F_{s2}'' \ldots F_{sb}''$ be the connected components of F_s''. Construct a bipartite graph $B_s = (B_s' \cup B_s'', E(B_s))$, where $B_s' = \{F_{s1}', F_{s2}', \ldots F_{sa}'\}$ and $B_s'' = \{F_{s1}'', F_{s2}'', \ldots F_{sb}''\}$ and there is any edge between F_{sx}' and F_{sy}'' if and only if $V(F_{sx}') \cap V(F_{sy}'') \neq \varnothing$, for $x \in [a]$ and $y \in [b]$. Note that $|V(F_s') \cap V(F_s'')| \ge |E(B_s)|$, and since the graph F_s is connected, the graph B_s is also connected. Therefore,

$$|V(F_s') \cap V(F_s'')| \ge |E(B_s)| \ge |V(B_s)| - 1 = \nu(F_s') + \nu(F_s'') - 1,$$

This implies,

$$|V(F_s)| = |V(F_s')| + |V(F_s'')| - |V(F_s') \cap V(F_s'')| \le |V(F_s')| - \nu(F_s') + |V(F_s'')| - \nu(F_s'') + 1.$$

Then, recalling (2.18), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(H) &= \prod_{s\in I_1} \beta(F_s) \prod_{s\in I_2} \beta(F_s) \prod_{s\in I_{12}} \beta(F_s) \\ &= \prod_{s\in I_{12}} \left(\frac{1}{c_n}\right)^{|V(F_s)|-1} \prod_{s\in I_1} \beta(F_s) \prod_{s\in I_2} \beta(F_s) \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \left(\prod_{s\in I_{12}}\left(\frac{1}{c_n}\right)^{|V(F_s')|-\nu(F_s')}\prod_{s\in I_1}\beta(F_s)\right)\left(\prod_{s\in I_{12}}\left(\frac{1}{c_n}\right)^{|V(F_s'')|-\nu(F_s'')}\prod_{s\in I_2}\beta(F_s)\right)$$
$$=\beta(H_1)\beta(H_2),$$

completing the proof of the lemma. □

Now, recall the definitions of the graphs $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ and $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$ from Section 2.1. Now, by definition (2.3),

$$T_+(K_{1,2},G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{v\in V_\varepsilon(G_n)}\sum_{1\leq u<w\leq |V(G_n)|} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon})a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon})\mathbf{1}\{X_v=X_u=X_w\}$$
$$= \sum_{(u,v,w)\in\mathscr{S}(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})}\mathbf{1}\{X_u=X_v=X_w\}, \tag{2.19}$$

where $\mathscr{S}(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ is the collection of ordered triplets (u,v,w), with $u,v,w\in V(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ such that $(u,v),(v,w)\in E(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$, that is, (u,v,w) is a 2-star in $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ with central vertex $v\in V(G_{n,\varepsilon})$. Similarly,

$$T(K_{1,2},G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{v\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)}\sum_{\substack{u<w\\ u,w\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)}} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon})a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon})\mathbf{1}\{X_v=X_u=X_w\}$$
$$= \sum_{(u,v,w)\in\mathscr{S}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})}\mathbf{1}\{X_u=X_v=X_w\}, \tag{2.20}$$

where $\mathscr{S}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ is the collection of ordered triplets (u,v,w), with $u,v,w\in V(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ such that $(u,v),(v,w)\in E(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$.

Now, denote by $\Gamma=\mathscr{S}(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^r\times\mathscr{S}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^s$, the collection of all $r+s$ ordered triples

$$(u_1,v_1,w_1),(u_2,v_2,w_2),\ldots,(u_r,v_r,w_r),(u_{r+1},v_{r+1},w_{r+1}),\ldots(u_{r+s},v_{r+s},w_{r+s}),$$

such that $(u_a,v_a,w_a)\in\mathscr{S}(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$, for $a\in[r]$, and $(u_b,v_b,w_b)\in\mathscr{S}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$, for $b\in[r+1,r+s]$. Then expanding the product $T_+(K_{1,2},G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^rT(K_{1,2},G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^s$ over the sum, the LHS of (2.6) can be bounded above by:

$$\sum_\Gamma\Bigg|\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{a=1}^r\mathbf{1}\{X_{u_a}=X_{v_a}=X_{w_a}\}\prod_{b=r+1}^{r+s}\mathbf{1}\{X_{u_b}=X_{v_b}=X_{w_b}\}\right)$$
$$-\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{a=1}^r\mathbf{1}\{X_{u_a}=X_{v_a}=X_{w_a}\}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{b=r+1}^{r+s}1\{X_{u_b}=X_{v_b}=X_{w_b}\}\right)\Bigg|$$
$$=\sum_\Gamma|\beta(H_1\cup H_2)-\beta(H_1)\beta(H_2)| \tag{2.21}$$

where $\beta(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.17) and

- H_1 is the simple labelled subgraph of $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ obtained by the union of the 2-stars formed by the triples (u_a,v_a,w_a), for $a\in[r]$,
- H_2 is the simple labelled subgraph of $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$ obtained by the union of the 2-stars formed by the triples (u_b,v_b,w_b), for $b\in[r+1,r+s]$.

Note that if $V(H_1)\cap V(H_2)=\varnothing$, then $\beta(H_1\cup H_2)=\beta(H_1)\beta(H_2)$. Therefore, without of generality assume that $V(H_1)\cap V(H_2)\neq\varnothing$.

Observation 2.3. *If $V(H_1) \cap V(H_2) \neq \varnothing$, then $H_1 \cup H_2$ has a P_4.*

Proof. Suppose $a \in [r]$ and $b \in [r+1, r+s]$ is such that, $(u_a, v_a, w_a) \in \mathscr{S}(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $(u_b, v_b, w_b) \in \mathscr{S}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$, and (u_a, v_a, w_a) and (u_b, v_b, w_b) share at least one common vertex.



FIGURE 2. Proof of Observation 2.3.

By definition, v_a is the central vertex of the 2-star (u_a, v_a, w_a), and, thus, $v_a \in V_\varepsilon(G_n)$, and $u_a, w_a \notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)$. This implies $v_a \notin V(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$, and either the vertex u_a or w_a must belong to the set $\{u_b, v_b, w_b\}$. Without of loss generality, assume that $u_a \in \{u_b, v_b, w_b\}$. Consider the following cases:

- $u_a = u_b$**:** If $v_b \neq w_a$, then $(w_a, v_a), (v_a, u_a), (u_b, v_b)$ form a P_4. Otherwise, $v_b = w_a$, and $(u_a, v_a), (v_a, w_a), (w_a, w_b)$ form a P_4 (see Figure 2).
- $u_a = v_b$**:** As v_b is the central vertex of the 2-star (u_b, v_b, w_b), either $(w_a, v_a), (v_a, u_a), (u_a, u_b)$ or $(w_a, v_a), (v_a, u_a), (u_a, w_b)$ form a P_4, because at least one of the 2 vertices u_b and w_b is not equal to w_a.
- $u_a = w_b$**:** This is similar to the first case: If $v_b \neq w_a$, then $(w_a, v_a), (v_a, u_a), (w_b, v_b)$ form a P_4. Otherwise, $v_b = w_a$, and $(u_a, v_a), (v_a, w_a), (v_b, u_b)$ form a P_4. □

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{H}_m$ denote the set of all unlabelled graphs $H = (V(H), E(H))$ which can be formed by the union of m copies of $K_{1,2}$.

For any $H \in \mathcal{H}_m$ denote by $N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon})$ the number of copies of H in $G_{n,\varepsilon}$. Now, recalling that $\beta(H_1 \cup H_2) = \beta(H_1)\beta(H_2)$, if $V(H_1) \cap V(H_2) = \varnothing$, and $\beta(H_1 \cup H_2) \geq \beta(H_1)\beta(H_2)$ otherwise, using Observation 2.3, the RHS of (2.21) can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\Gamma} |\beta(H_1 \cup H_2) - \beta(H_1)\beta(H_2)| \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{\Gamma} \beta(H_1 \cup H_2) \mathbf{1}\{H_1 \cup H_2 \text{ contains a } P_4\} \\
&\quad = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{r+s}} \sum_{\Gamma : H_1 \cup H_2 \cong H} \beta(H_1 \cup H_2) \mathbf{1}\{H \text{ contains a } P_4\} \\
&\quad \lesssim \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{r+s}} \beta(H) N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}\{H \text{ contains a } P_4\} \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{r+s}} \frac{N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}\{H \text{ contains a } P_4\}}{c_n^{|V(H)| - \nu(H)}}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where the last equality uses $\beta(H) = \frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}}$ (by Lemma 2.9).

Now, if a graph $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r+s}$ contains a P_4 as a subgraph, invoking Lemma 2.8 implies,

$$N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \le N(H, G_n) = o(N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{\frac{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}{2}}) = o(c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}),$$

where the last step $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = O(c_n^2)$ (recall (1.4)). This implies

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{r+s}} \frac{N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}\{H \text{ contains a } P_4\}}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}} = o(1),$$

since $\mathcal{H}_{r+s}$ is a finite set. Therefore, (2.22), and (2.21), goes to zero, as $n \to \infty$, which completes the proof of the lemma. □

Another consequence of Lemma 2.14, is that all the moments of $\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ are bounded. We record this in the following observation, for future use.

Observation 2.4. *Suppose (1.4) holds. Then, for any integer $s \ge 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(s) < \infty$ such that for all n large, $\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n)^s \le C$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 2.4 above, a direct expansion of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)^s$ gives

$$\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n)^s \lesssim \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_s} N(H, G_n)\beta(H) \le \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_s} \frac{N(H, G_n)}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}},$$

from which the desired conclusion follows on using (2.13) along with (1.4), and the fact that $\mathcal{H}_s$ is a finite set. □

2.4. **Proof of Lemma 2.5.** For any unlabelled graph H define

$$\eta(H) := \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{(u,v) \in E(H)} Y_{uv}\right) = \frac{1}{c_n^{|E(H)|}}.$$

Note that $\beta(H) \ge \eta(H)$, since $|E(H)| \ge |V(H)| - \nu(H)$.

Denote by $\Gamma = \mathscr{S}(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s$ the collection of all s ordered triples $(u_1, v_1, w_1), (u_2, v_2, w_2), \ldots, (u_s, v_s, w_s)$, such that $(u_a, v_a, w_a) \in \mathscr{S}(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$, for $a \in [s]$ (where $\mathscr{S}(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)$ is as defined below (2.19)). Expanding $T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s$ and $W_1(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s - \mathbb{E}W_2(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s| &\le \sum_{\Gamma} \left| \mathbb{E}\prod_{a=1}^s \mathbf{1}\{X_{u_a} = X_{v_a} = X_{w_a}\} - \mathbb{E}\prod_{a=1}^s Y_{u_a v_a} \right| \\ &= \sum_{\Gamma} |\beta(H) - \eta(H)| \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.17) and H is the simple labelled subgraph of $G_{n,\varepsilon}^+$ obtained by the union of the 2-stars formed by the triples (u_a, v_a, w_a), for $a \in [s]$. This implies,

$$|\mathbb{E}T_+(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s - \mathbb{E}W_1(G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)^s| \lesssim \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_s} N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}^+)|\beta(H) - \eta(H)|, \tag{2.23}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_s$ is as in Definition 2.2.

Fix $H \in \mathcal{H}_s$, and let $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{\nu(H)}$ be the connected components of H. If all the components of H are star graphs, then $\beta(H_a) = \eta(H_a) = \frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H_a)|-1}}$, for all $a \in [\nu(H)]$. This implies $\beta(H) = \eta(H)$, and the sum in RHS of (2.23) reduces to graphs $H \in \mathcal{H}_s$, where at least one component of

H, say H_1, is not a star graph. Recall that by construction $G^+_{n,\varepsilon}$ is bipartite, hence H_1 is not a triangle. Then using (2.14) and $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = \Theta(c_n^2)$, it follows that $N(H_1, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) \le N(H_1, G_n) = o(c_n^{|V(H_1)|-1})$. Therefore,

$$N(H, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) \le N(H, G_n) \lesssim N(H_1, G_n) \prod_{a=2}^{\nu(H)} N(H_a, G_n) = o(c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}),$$

using the bound $N(H_a, G_n) = O(c_n^{|V(H_1)|-1})$, for $a \in [2, \nu(H)]$ (from (2.13)).

This implies that for any $H \in \mathcal{H}_s$, either $\beta(H) = \eta(H)$ or $N(H, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})|\beta(H) - \eta(H)| = o(1)$, as $n \to \infty$. This implies that the RHS of (2.23) goes to zero, since $\mathcal{H}_s$ is a finite set, completing the proof of (2.23).

Finally, the bound on the s-th moment of $T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ follows from Observation 2.4: $\mathbb{E}T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^s \le \mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})^s = O(1)$.

2.5. **Proof of Lemma 2.6.** Denote by $\Gamma = \mathscr{S}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^s$ the collection of all s ordered triples $(u_1, v_1, w_1), (u_2, v_2, w_2), \ldots, (u_s, v_s, w_s)$, such that $(u_a, v_a, w_a) \in \mathscr{S}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$, for $a \in [s]$ (where $\mathscr{S}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ is as defined below (2.20)). Then by the multinomial expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^s - \mathbb{E}W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^s| &\le \sum_{\Gamma} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} \mathbf{1}\{X_{u_a} = X_{v_a} = X_{w_a}\} - \mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} \right| \\ &= \sum_{\Gamma} |\beta(H) - \mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a}| \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

where $\beta(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.17) and H is the simple labelled subgraph of $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$ obtained by the union of the 2-stars formed by the triples (u_a, v_a, w_a), for $a \in [s]$.

Observation 2.5. *$\mathbb{E}\prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} \le \beta(H) = \frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}}$, where H is defined above, and equality holds when each connected component of H is a 2-star or a triangle.*

Proof. The proof is done by induction on s. If $s = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}Z_{u_1 v_1 w_1} = \frac{1}{c^2}$, and the result holds trivially. Now, suppose that the result holds for some $s \ge 1$ triples. If $(u_{s+1}, v_{s+1}, w_{s+1}) \in \{(u_a, v_a, w_a) : a \in [s]\}$, then the graph formed by the $s+1$ triples is the same as the graph formed by the s triples, and

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s+1} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} = \mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} \le \frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}}$$

by induction hypothesis.

Otherwise, $(u_{s+1}, v_{s+1}, w_{s+1}) \notin \{(u_a, v_a, w_a) : a \in [s]\}$, and denote by H' the simple labelled graph obtained by the union of the 2-stars formed by the triples $\{(u_a, v_a, w_a) : a \in [s+1]\}$. Then by the independence of the collection $\{Z_{uvw}\}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s+1} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} = \mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} \mathbb{E} Z_{u_{s+1} v_{s+1} w_{s+1}} \le \frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}} \cdot \frac{1}{c_n^2} \le \frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H')|-\nu(H')}}$$

where the last step holds whenever $|V(H')| - \nu(H') \le |V(H)| - \nu(H) + 2$.

Therefore, to complete the proof it suffices to show the above inequality. Consider the following two cases:

– If the triple $(u_{s+1}, v_{s+1}, w_{s+1})$ is vertex disjoint from the union of all the other s-triples, then $|V(H')| = |V(H)| + 3$ and $\nu(H') = \nu(H) + 1$, which implies $|V(H')| - \nu(H') = |V(H)| - \nu(H) + 2$.
– If the triple $(u_{s+1}, v_{s+1}, w_{s+1})$ shares at least one vertex with the union of all the other s-triples, then $|V(H')| \leq |V(H)| + 2$ and $\nu(H') = \nu(H)$, which gives $|V(H')| - \nu(H') \leq |V(H)| - \nu(H) + 2$.

Finally, note that if each connected component of H is a 2-star or a triangle, then

$$\mathbb{E}\prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} = \frac{1}{c^{2s'}} = \frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}},$$

where $s' \leq s$ is the number of distinct triples in $\{(u_1, v_1, w_1), \cdots, (u_s, v_s, w_s)\}$, and $|V(H)| = 3s'$ and $\nu(H) = s'$. □

The above observation and (2.24) gives

$$|\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)^s - \mathbb{E}W_2(G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)^s| \leq \sum_{\Gamma} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{\exists \text{ a connected component } H_1 \text{ of } H \text{ such that } H_1 \notin \{K_{1,2}, K_3\}\}}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}}$$
$$\lesssim \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_s^-} \frac{N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}}, \tag{2.25}$$

where the $\mathcal{H}_s^-$ is collection of all graphs H which can be formed by the union of s copies of $K_{1,2}$, such that at least one connected component of H, say H_1, is not a 2-star or a triangle. The following lemma gives estimates for the number of copies of $H \in \mathcal{H}_s^-$ in $G_{n,\varepsilon}^-$.

Lemma 2.10. *For every $H \in \mathcal{H}_s^-$, $N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-) = o(c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)})$, as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$.*

Proof. Let H_1 be the connected component of H which is not a 2-star or a triangle. By decomposing into connected components and using (2.13), it suffices to show that $N(H_1, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-) = o(c_n^{|V(H_1)|-\nu(H_1)})$.

If H_1 is a r-star for some $r \geq 3$, then it has $r+1$ vertices, and so

$$\frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H_1)|-1}} N(H_1, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-) \leq \sum_{v \in V(G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)} \frac{d_v^r}{c_n^r} \leq \varepsilon^{r-2} \sum_{v \in V(G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)} \frac{d_v^2}{c_n^2} \lesssim \varepsilon^{|V(H_1)|-3}. \tag{2.26}$$

Also, if H_1 is neither a star graph nor a triangle, then

$$\frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H_1)|-1}} N(H_1, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-) \leq \frac{N(H_1, G_n)}{c_n^{|V(H_1)|-1}} = o(1), \tag{2.27}$$

where the last step uses (2.14) of Lemma 2.8 and the $o(1)$ term goes to zero as $n \to \infty$. Combining (2.26) and (2.27), and

$$\frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H_1)|-1}} N(H_1, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-) \lesssim \varepsilon^{|V(H_1)|-3} + o(1) \to 0,$$

as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$. □

From the above lemma, the RHS of (2.25) goes to zero (as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$), since $\mathcal{H}_s^-$ is a finite set. This proves (2.9). Finally, the bound on the s-th moment of $T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)$ follows from Observation 2.4: $\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon}^-)^s \leq \mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_{n,\varepsilon})^s = O(1)$, completing the proof of Theorem 2.6.

2.6. **Approximating the Moments of $T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$.** Our next lemma shows that moments of $T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ are asymptotically close.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ be as defined in (2.7) and (2.8), respectively. Then for any $s \geq 1$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|\mathbb{E}\left\{T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})\right\}^s - \mathbb{E}\left\{W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})\right\}^s\right| = 0,$$

whenever (1.4) holds.

Proof. For a fixed integer $s \geq 1$, by the binomial expansion

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\mathbb{E}\left\{T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})\right\}^s - \mathbb{E}\left\{W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})\right\}^s\right| \\ &\leq \sum_{a=0}^{s}\binom{s}{a}\left|\mathbb{E}\{T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^a T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^{s-a}\}, -\mathbb{E}W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^a \mathbb{E}W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^{s-a}\right| \qquad (2.28)\end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that for every $a \in [s]$, by Lemma 2.4,

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\{T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^a T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^{s-a}\} - \mathbb{E}T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^a \mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^{s-a}\right| = o(1), \qquad (2.29)$$

as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$. Next, by Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.6, and the triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\left|\mathbb{E}T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^a \mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^{s-a} - \mathbb{E}W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^a \mathbb{E}W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^{s-a}\right| = o(1), \qquad (2.30)$$

as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$. Now, since $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ are independent by construction, combining (2.29) and (2.30), gives

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|\mathbb{E}\{T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^a T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^{s-a}\} - \mathbb{E}\{W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})^a W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})^{s-a}\}\right| = 0.$$

This implies every term in the sum in the RHS of (2.28) goes to zero, and the result follows. □

The above lemma shows that $T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ is close in moments to $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$. To obtain the limiting distribution $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ we will now show that $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ converge in moments.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ be as defined in (2.7) and (2.8), respectively. Assume (1.4) and (1.6).*

(a) *$W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) \to \sum_{v=1}^{\infty}\binom{R_v}{2}$ in distribution and in moments,[5] where $R_1, R_2, \ldots,$ are independent $\mathrm{Pois}(\theta_1), \mathrm{Pois}(\theta_2), \ldots,$ respectively, with $\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots,$ as defined in (1.6).*

(b) *$W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) \to 3Q_1 + Q_2$ in distribution and in moments, where Q_1, Q_2 are independent and $Q_1 \sim \mathrm{Pois}(\nu)$ and $Q_2 \sim \mathrm{Pois}\left(\lambda - 3\nu - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v=1}^{\infty}\theta_v^2\right)$, with λ and ν as defined in Theorem 1.2.*

Proof. Recall that $d_{(1)} \geq d_{(2)} \geq \ldots \geq d_{(|V(G_n)|)}$ are the degrees of the vertices in G_n in decreasing order, such that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{d_{(v)}}{c_n} = \theta_v$, for each $v \geq 1$. Then by Fatou's lemma along with (2.1) we have $\sum_{v=1}^{\infty}\theta_v^2 \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{c_n^2}\sum_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v^2 \lesssim \lambda < \infty$.

[5] A sequence of random variables $\{Z_{n,\varepsilon}\}$ is said to converge to Z in distribution and in moments, if $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(Z_{n,\varepsilon} \leq t) = \mathbb{P}(Z \leq t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(Z \leq t)$ is continuous; and $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}Z_{n,\varepsilon}^s = \mathbb{E}Z^s$, for all integers $s \geq 1$.

Recall that

$$W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) := \sum_{v\in V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{1\le u<w\le |V(G_n)|} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon})a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon})Y_{uv}Y_{uw} = \sum_{v\in V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \binom{D_{(v)}}{2},$$

where $\{D_{(v)}\}_{v\in V_\varepsilon(G_n)}$ is a collection of independent random variables with $D_{(v)} \sim \text{Bin}(d_{(v)}, \frac{1}{c_n})$. Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{d_{(v)}}{c_n} = \theta_v$, $\binom{D_{(v)}}{2}$ converges in distribution and in moments to $R_v \sim \text{Pois}(\theta_v)$, as $n \to \infty$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ which does not belong to the set $\{\theta_v, v \ge 1\}$, and let $K_\varepsilon := \frac{8\lambda}{\varepsilon^2}$. From the proof of Lemma 2.1, it is easy to see that $|\{v : d_v \ge \varepsilon c_n\}| \le K_\varepsilon$. Therefore, recalling that $R_1, R_2, \ldots$ are independent $\text{Pois}(\theta_1), \text{Pois}(\theta_2), \ldots$, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{v=1}^{|V(G_n)|} \binom{D_{(v)}}{2}\mathbf{1}\{d_{(v)} > \varepsilon c_n\} &= \sum_{v=1}^{K_\varepsilon} \binom{D_{(v)}}{2}\mathbf{1}\{d_{(v)} > \varepsilon c_n\} \\ &\to \sum_{v:\theta_v>\varepsilon} \binom{R_v}{2}\mathbf{1}\{\theta_v > \varepsilon\}, \end{aligned}$$

in distribution and in moments, as $n \to \infty$.

Next, note that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{v:\theta_v>\varepsilon} \binom{R_v}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v:\theta_v>\varepsilon} \theta_v^2 \le \lambda.$$

Therefore, $\sum_{v:\theta_v>\varepsilon} \binom{R_v}{2}$ converges almost surely to a finite limit, that is, $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \sum_{v:\delta_v>\varepsilon} \binom{R_v}{2} := \sum_{v=1}^\infty \binom{R_v}{2}$ exists and is a finite valued random variable. Moreover, by the monotone convergence theorem, for every integer $s \ge 1$, $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{v:\theta_v>\varepsilon} \binom{R_v}{2}\right)^s = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{v=1}^\infty \binom{R_v}{2}\right)^s$, showing the convergence in moments of $W_1(G^+_{n,\varepsilon})$ under the joint limit as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Next, recall that

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) &:= \sum_{v\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{\substack{u<w \\ u,w\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)}} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon})a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon})Z_{uvw} \\ &= W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) + W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

where

$$W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{v\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{\substack{u<w \\ u,w\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)}} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon})a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon})(1 - a_{uw}(G_{n,\varepsilon}))Z_{uvw},$$

and

$$W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{v\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)} \sum_{\substack{u<w \\ u,w\notin V_\varepsilon(G_n)}} a_{vu}(G_{n,\varepsilon})a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon})a_{uw}(G_{n,\varepsilon})Z_{uvw}.$$

First, note that $W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ counts the number of monochromatic induced 2-stars in $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$. Therefore, as $n \to \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})) &= \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) - 3N(K_3, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})}{c_n^2} \\ &= \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n) - N(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) - 3N(K_3, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})}{c_n^2} + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\to \lambda - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v:\theta_v>\varepsilon}^{\infty}\theta_v^2 - 3\nu,$$

where the third step uses Lemma 2.2, and the last step the assumptions in Theorem 1.2 and (2.32) below. Now, since $W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ is the sum of i.i.d. $\mathrm{Bin}(1, \frac{1}{c_n^2})$ random variables, (each variable Z_{uvw} appears only once since the sum is over induced 2-stars) $W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) \xrightarrow{D} \mathrm{Pois}\left(\lambda - 3\nu - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v:\theta_v>\varepsilon}^{\infty}\theta_v^2\right)$, as $n \to \infty$, and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}(W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}))^s = \mathbb{E}(\mathrm{Pois}\left(\lambda - 3\nu - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v:\theta_v>\varepsilon}^{\infty}\theta_v^2\right))^s$, for all integers $s \geq 1$. Therefore, $W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) \to Q_2 \sim \mathrm{Pois}\left(\lambda - 3\nu - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v=1}^{\infty}\theta_v^2\right)$, in distribution and in moments under the joint limit.

Next, note that $W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ counts the number of non-induced monochromatic 2-stars in $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$. Here, each variable Z_{uvw} appears three times in the sum, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})) = \frac{3N(K_3, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})}{c_n^2} &= \frac{3N(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon})}{c_n^2} \\ &= \frac{3N(K_3, G_n)}{c_n^2} + o(1) \to 3\nu, \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

where the second equality follows since $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$ is triangle-free, the third equality by Lemma 2.2, the last step by (1.5). Now, since $W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ is the sum of i.i.d. $\mathrm{Bin}(1, \frac{1}{c_n^2})$ random variables, where every variable appears 3 times, we get $W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) \to 3Q_1 \sim 3\,\mathrm{Pois}(\nu)$, in distribution and in moments.

Finally, since $W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ and $W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ are independent, (2.31) implies that $W_2(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) \to 3Q_1 + Q_2$, in distribution and in moments under the joint limit. □

2.7. **Completing the Proof of Theorem 1.2.** In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 using the above lemmas. Lemma 2.12 implies that $W_{21}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) + W_{22}(G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ converges in moments to $Z := \sum_{v=1}^{\infty}\binom{R_v}{2} + 3Q_1 + Q_2$, where $R_1, R_2, \ldots, Q_1$, and Q_2 are as defined in Theorem 1.2. Then by Lemma 2.11, $T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon})$ converges in moments to Z. Now, by Proposition A.1, Z satisfies the Stieltjes moment condition [1], therefore, it is uniquely determined by its moments. This implies $T_+(K_{1,2}, G^+_{n,\varepsilon}) + T(K_{1,2}, G^-_{n,\varepsilon}) \xrightarrow{D} Z$, and hence, $T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} Z$ (by (2.5)). Convergence in moments follows from Observation 2.4. This completes the proof of part (1) in Theorem 1.2.

To prove the converse, invoking Proposition 1.1 we can assume, without loss of generality, that $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = O(c_n^2)$. Now, by passing to a subsequence, assume that both the limits $N(K_{1,2}, G_n)/c_n^2$ and $N(K_3, G_n)/c_n^2$ converge. Denote the corresponding limits by λ and ν, respectively. Finally using (2.1) we have $\max_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v = O(c_n)$, and so the infinite tuple $\{d_v/c_n\}_{v\geq 1}$ is an element of $[0, K]^{\mathbb{N}}$ for some K fixed. Since $[0, K]^{\mathbb{N}}$ is compact in product topology, there is a further subsequence along which d_v/c_n converges for every $v \geq 1$ simultaneously. Thus, moving to a subsequence, we can assume that d_v/c_n converges to θ_v for every v. Invoking the sufficiency part of the theorem gives that $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ converges in distribution to a random variable of the desired form, completing the proof.

2.8. **Proof of Corollary 1.3.** The proof of $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ is immediate from Theorem 1.2, so it suffices to prove $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$, that is, if $T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} 3Q_1 + Q_2$ with Q_1, Q_2 independent random variables with distributions $\mathrm{Pois}(\nu)$ and $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda - 3\nu)$ respectively, then (1.5) and (1.6) must hold.

To this effect, first note that the convergence in distribution of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ implies that (1.4) holds (Proposition 1.1). Thus, by a similar argument which was used to prove the converse of Theorem 1.2, it follows that along a subsequence both (1.5) and (1.6) hold. Let the corresponding

limiting parameters along this subsequence be denoted by λ', ν', and $\{\theta'_v\}_{v\geq 1}$. Since $T(K_{1,2},, G_n)$ converges in distribution to $3Q_1 + Q_2$ which has finite exponential moment for all $t > 0$, it follows that $\theta'_v = 0$ for all $v \geq 1$, and consequently (1.6) holds. This also gives $3Q_1 + Q_2 \stackrel{D}{=} 3Q'_1 + Q'_2$, where Q'_1 and Q'_2 are independent random variables with distribution $\text{Pois}(\nu')$ and $\text{Pois}(\lambda' - 3\nu')$. By matching the first two moments of $3Q_1+Q_2$ and $3Q'_1+Q'_2$ we get $\lambda = \lambda'$ and $\nu = \nu'$. Therefore, every sub sequential limit of $\frac{N(K_{1,2},G_n)}{c_n^2}$ and $\frac{N(K_3,G_n)}{c_n^2}$ equal λ and ν, respectively, hence, (1.5) holds.

2.9. **Proof of Corollary 1.4.** To begin, assume that $\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ and $Var(T(K_{1,2}, G_n))$ both converge to λ as $n \to \infty$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) &= \sum_{v\in V(G_n)} \sum_{1\leq u<w\leq |V(G_n)|} a_{vu}(G_n)a_{vw}(G_n)\,\text{Var}(\mathbf{1}\{X_v = X_u = X_w\}) + T_0 \\ &= N(K_{1,2}, G_n)\left(\frac{1}{c_n^2} - \frac{1}{c_n^4}\right) + R_n, \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

where the covariance term

$$R_n := \sum_J a_{vu}(G_n)a_{vw}(G_n)a_{v'u'}(G_n)a_{v'w'}(G_n)\,\text{Cov}(\mathbf{1}\{X_v = X_u = X_w\}, \mathbf{1}\{X_{v'} = X_{u'} = X_{w'}\})$$

and J is the collection of all pairs of triples $((u, v, w), (u', v', w'))$ such that $v, v' \in V(G_n), 1 \leq u < w \leq |V(G_n)|, 1 \leq u' < w \leq |V(G_n)|$ and $(u, v, w) \neq (u', v', w')$. Note that the condition $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \frac{N(K_{1,2},G_n)}{c_n^2} \to \lambda$ and $\text{Var}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) \to \lambda$ implies that $R_n \to 0$.

Observe that $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{1}\{X_v = X_u = X_w\}, \mathbf{1}\{X_{v'} = X_{u'} = X_{w'}\}) = 0$ whenever $|\{u, v, w\} \cap \{u', v', w'\}| \leq 1$. Therefore, assume that $|\{u, v, w\} \cap \{u', v', w'\}| = 2$, and

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{1}\{X_v = X_u = X_w\}, \mathbf{1}\{X_{v'} = X_{u'} = X_{w'}\}) = \frac{1}{c_n^3} - \frac{1}{c_n^4} = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{c_n^3}\right).$$

The sum over J can now be decomposed depending on how the two triples overlap, giving

$$R_n = \Theta\left(\frac{N(K_{1,3}, G_n) + N(K_3, G_n) + N(P_4, G_n) + N(C_4, G_n)}{c_n^3}\right), \tag{2.34}$$

where C_4 denotes the 4-cycle. The condition $R_n \to 0$ then implies that $\frac{N(K_3,G_n)}{c_n^3} \to 0$ and $\frac{N(K_{1,3},G_n)}{c_n^3} \to 0$, which implies that $\max_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v = o(c_n)$. Then, by Corollary 1.3 we have $T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \stackrel{D}{\to} \text{Pois}(\lambda)$.

For the converse direction, assume that $T(K_{1,2},, G_n) \stackrel{D}{\to} Q_2$, where $Q_2 \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$. Then invoking the converse direction of Corollary 1.3 we immediately get that

$$\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n) = \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}{c_n^2} \to \lambda, \quad \max_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v = o(c_n), \quad N(K_3, G_n) = o(c_n^2),$$

which along with (2.34) implies $R_n = o(1)$ (as in the proof of Proposition 1.1 in Appendix A.1). This along with (2.33), shows that $\text{Var}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ converges to λ as well, and so the proof is complete.

3. Examples

In this section we apply Theorem 1.2 to different deterministic and random graph models, and determine the specific nature of the limiting distribution.

Example 1. (Disjoint Union of Stars) The proof of Theorem 1.2 shows that the quadratic term in the limiting distribution of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ appears due to the 2-stars incident on vertices with degree $\Theta(c_n)$. This can be seen when G_n is a disjoint union of star graphs.

- To begin with suppose $G_n = K_{1,n}$ is the n-star. Then $N(K_{1,2}, K_{1,n}) = \binom{n}{2}$, and we color $K_{1,n}$ with c_n colors such that $n/c_n \to 1$, which implies $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \frac{1}{2}$. Note that the maximum degree $d_{(1)} = n$, which implies $\theta_1 = 1$. Moreover, $d_{(2)} = 1$, which implies $\theta_v = 0$, for all $v \geq 2$. Therefore, by Theorem 1.2,
$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \sim \binom{R_1}{2},$$
where $R_1 \sim \text{Pois}(1)$. (Observe that $Q_1 = 0$ with probability 1 because the graph is triangle -free, and $Q_2 = 0$ with probability 1, since the graph $G^-_{n,\varepsilon}$ is empty.)
- Next, consider G_n to be the disjoint union of the following stars: $K_{1,\lfloor na_1 \rfloor}, K_{1,\lfloor na_2 \rfloor}, \ldots, K_{1,\lfloor na_n \rfloor}$, such that $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} a_s^2 < \infty$. In this case, $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = \sum_{s=1}^{n} \binom{\lfloor na_s \rfloor}{2} \sim \frac{n^2}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{n} a_s^2$. If G_n is colored with c_n colors such that $n/c_n \to 1$, then $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) \to \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} a_s^2$. Also, $d_{(v)} = \lfloor na_v \rfloor$, which implies $\theta_v = a_v$, for $v \geq 1$. This implies, by Theorem 1.2,
$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \binom{R_s}{2},$$
where $R_s \sim \text{Pois}(a_v)$ and $R_1, R_2, \ldots$ are independent. Here, the two terms linear in Poisson do not contribute, as G_n has no triangles, and $\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \sim \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \theta_v^2$.
- Finally, consider G_n to be the disjoint union of the following stars:
$$K_{1,\lfloor na_1 + \sqrt{n} \rfloor}, K_{1,\lfloor na_2 + \sqrt{n} \rfloor}, \ldots, K_{1,\lfloor na_n + \sqrt{n} \rfloor}.$$
In this case, $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = \sum_{s=1}^{n} \binom{\lfloor na_s + \sqrt{n} \rfloor}{2} \sim n^2 + \frac{n^2}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{n} a_s^2$, as the assumption $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} a_s^2 < \infty$ implies $\sum_{s=1}^{n} a_s = o(\sqrt{n})$. If G_n is colored with c_n colors such that $n/c_n \to 1$, then $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) \to \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} a_s^2 + 1$. Also, $d_{(v)} = \lfloor na_v + \sqrt{n} \rfloor$, which implies $\theta_v = a_v$, for $v \geq 1$. In this case, however, we have $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) \sim 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \theta_v^2$, and so Theorem 1.2 gives
$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \binom{R_s}{2} + Q_2,$$
where $R_s \sim \text{Pois}(a_v)$ and $R_1, R_2, \ldots$ are independent, and $Q_2 \sim \text{Pois}(1)$ independent of $\{R_s\}_{s \geq 1}$.

Next, we see examples where there are no vertices of high degree, in which case, the quadratic term vanishes (Corollary 1.3).

Example 2. (Regular Graphs) Let G_n be a d-regular graph. In this case, $N(K_{1,2}, G_n) = n\binom{d}{2}$. Consider uniformly coloring the graph with c_n colors such that $\frac{1}{c_n^2} n \binom{d}{2} \to \lambda$. In this case, $\Delta(G_n) = \max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v = d = o(c_n)$. Therefore, by Corollary 1.3,
$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} 3Q_1 + Q_2,$$
where $Q_1 \sim \text{Pois}(\nu)$ (recall $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{N(K_3, G_n)}{c_n^2} = \nu$) and $Q_2 \sim \text{Pois}\,(\lambda - 3\nu)$ are independent, whenever (1.5) holds. Depending on the number of triangles in G_n, there are different possibilities:

- $G_n = K_{n,n}$, the regular bipartite graph. Since, bipartite graphs are triangle-free, $N(K_3, G_n) = 0$, and $T(K_{1,2}, K_{n,n}) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(\lambda)$.
- $G_n = K_n$, the complete graph. In this case, $\frac{1}{c_n^2} N(K_3, G_n) = \frac{1}{c_n^2}\binom{n}{3} \to \frac{\lambda}{3}$, and $T(K_{1,2}, K_n) \xrightarrow{D} 3Q_1$, where $Q_1 \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda/3)$. (Note that in this case, $Q_2 = 0$ with probability 1, since K_n has no induced 2-stars.)

Another class of naturally arising class of graphs where the are no vertices of high degree are converging sequence of dense graphs introduced by Lovász and coauthors [8, 9, 26]. Graph limit theory connects various topics such as graph homomorphisms, Szemerédi regularity lemma, quasirandom graphs, graph testing and extremal graph theory, and has even found applications in statistics and related areas [11]. For a detailed exposition of the theory of graph limits refer to Lovász [26]. In the following, we mention the basic definitions about the convergence of graph sequences. If F and G are two graphs, then

$$t(F, G) := \frac{|\hom(F, G)|}{|V(G)|^{|V(F)|}},$$

where $|\hom(F, G)|$ denotes the number of homomorphisms of F into G. In fact, $t(F, G)$ denotes the probability that a random mapping $\phi : V(F) \to V(G)$ defines a graph homomorphism. The basic definition is that a sequence G_n of graphs converges if $t(F, G_n)$ converges for every graph F.

There is a natural limit object in the form of a function $W \in \mathscr{W}$, where $\mathscr{W}$ is the space of all measurable functions from $[0, 1]^2$ into $[0, 1]$ that satisfy $W(x, y) = W(y, x)$ for all x, y. Conversely, every such function arises as the limit of an appropriate graph sequence. This limit object determines all the limits of subgraph densities: if H is a simple graph with $V(H) = \{1, 2, \ldots, |V(H)|\}$, let

$$t(H, W) = \int_{[0,1]^{|V(H)|}} \prod_{(i,j)\in E(H)} W(x_i, x_j) dx_1 dx_2 \cdots dx_{|V(H)|}.$$

A sequence of graphs $\{G_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ is said to converge to W if for every finite simple graph H,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} t(H, G_n) = t(H, W).$$

The limit objects, that is, the elements of $\mathscr{W}$, are called *graph limits* or *graphons*. It turns out that the notion of convergence in terms of subgraph densities outlined above can be suitably metrized using the so-called *cut distance* (refer to [26, Chapter 8]).

Example 3. (Dense Graphs) Let G_n be a sequence of dense graphs on n vertices converging to a graphon W. Consider coloring G_n with c_n colors such that $n^3/c_n^2 \to \kappa$. Then $\Delta(G_n) = \max_{v\in V(G_n)} d_v \leq n = o(c_n)$. Therefore, by definition,

$$\frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}{c_n^2} \to \frac{\kappa}{2} \int\int W(x, y) W(x, z) \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}z = \frac{\kappa}{2} t(K_{1,2}, W),$$

and

$$\frac{N(K_3, G_n)}{c_n^2} \to \frac{\kappa}{6} \int\int W(x, y) W(y, z) W(x, z) \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}z = \frac{\kappa}{6} t(K_3, W).$$

Then, by Corollary 1.3,

$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} 3Q_1 + Q_2,$$

where $Q_1 \sim \text{Pois}(\frac{\kappa}{6} t(K_3, W))$ and $Q_2 \sim \text{Pois}\left(\frac{\kappa}{2} t(K_{1,2}, W) - \frac{\kappa}{2} t(K_3, W)\right)$.

Note that in all the above examples, the limiting distribution either involves only the quadratic part or only the linear part. It is easy to construct examples where both the components show up by taking disjoint unions (or connecting them with a few edges) of the graphs in the above examples, as shown below:

Example 4. Let G_n be the graph in Figure 3. Note that it has three parts, a $K_{1,n}$, where one of the leaves is connected by a single edge to a $K_{n^{2/3}}$, which is connected by a single edge to a path P_{n^2}. Consider coloring this graph by c_n colors such that $c_n/n \to \kappa$. This implies

$$\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \frac{1}{c_n^2} N(K_{1,2}, G_n) \sim \frac{\binom{n}{2} + 3\binom{\lceil n^{2/3} \rceil}{3} + n^2}{c_n^2} \to 2\kappa^2.$$

Next, note that $\Delta(G_n) = n$, which corresponds to the central vertex of the $K_{1,n}$. Therefore, $\theta_1 = \kappa$. For every other vertex the degree is $o(n)$, which implies $\theta_v = 0$, for all $v \geq 2$. Finally, since $N(K_3, G_n) = \binom{\lceil n^{2/3} \rceil}{3}$, $\nu := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{c_n^2} N(K_3, G_n) = \frac{\kappa^2}{6}$. Therefore, by Theorem 1.2

$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \binom{R_1}{2} + 3Q_1 + Q_2,$$

where $R_1 \sim \text{Pois}(\kappa)$, $Q_1 \sim \text{Pois}(\frac{\kappa^2}{6})$, and $Q_2 \sim \text{Pois}(\frac{\kappa^2}{2})$.



FIGURE 3. Illustration for Example 4.

We note that a by a simple conditioning argument, Theorem 1.2 can be extended to random graphs by conditioning on the graph, under the assumption that the graph and its coloring are jointly independent. In this case, whenever the limits in (1.4) and (1.6) exist in probability, the limit (1.7) holds.

Example 5. (Random Graphs) Let $G_n \sim G(n, p(n))$ be the Erdős-Rényi random graph. In this case $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \frac{1}{c_n^2} n\binom{n-1}{2} p^2 \sim \frac{n^3 p^2}{2c_n^2}$. Consider uniformly coloring the graph with c_n colors such that $\frac{n^3 p^2}{2c_n^2} \to \lambda$. Now, depending on how p depends on n there are the following possibilities:

– $p(n) = p \in (0,1)$ *is fixed.* In this case $\Delta(G_n) = \max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v \leq n = o(c_n)$. Moreover, $\frac{1}{c_n^2} N(K_3, G_n) = (1 + o_P(1)) \frac{1}{c_n^2} \binom{n}{3} p^3 \xrightarrow{P} \lambda p/3$. Therefore, $T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} 3Q_1 + Q_2$, where

$$Q_1 \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda p/3), \text{ and } Q_2 \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda(1-p))$$

are independent.

– $p(n) \to 0, n^{3/2} p(n) \to \infty$. The assumption $n^{3/2} p(n) \to \infty$ is equivalent to the assumption that the number of 2-stars go to ∞. In this case $\frac{1}{c_n^2} N(K_3, G_n) = \frac{1}{c_n^2} \binom{n}{3} p^3 \xrightarrow{P} 0$. We claim that $\Delta(G_n) = \max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v = o_P(c_n)$, and so,

$$T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} Q_2,$$

where $Q_2 \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$. The claim on the maximum degree follows on invoking [25, Lemma 2.1], since $\Delta(G_n) = o_P(np\sqrt{n})$, in this regime of $p(n)$.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.6

In this section we prove Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.6. The proof of Theorem 1.5 has a truncation step followed by a moment comparison with the independent triple approximation (Lemma 4.1).

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.5.

To begin with note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(T(K_3, G_n) - T(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon}) > 0) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{(u,v) \in E_\varepsilon(G_n)} \mathbf{1}\{X_u = X_v\} > 0 \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{(u,v) \in E_\varepsilon(G_n)} \mathbf{1}\{X_u = X_v\} \right) \\
&= \frac{|E_\varepsilon(G_n)|}{c_n} \to 0,
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$ (using the assumption (1.10)). This implies,

$$T(K_3, G_n) = T(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon}) + o_P(1). \tag{4.1}$$

Therefore, to derive the distribution of $T(K_3, G_n)$ it suffices to derive the distribution of $T(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon})$. This will be shown using a moment comparison technique using the 'independent triple approximation', as in (2.8). To this end, define

$$W(G_{n,\varepsilon}) = \sum_{1 \leq u < v < w \leq |V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) a_{vw}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) a_{wu}(G_{n,\varepsilon}) Z_{uvw}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\{Z_{uvw}, v < u < w \in V(G_n)\}$ is a collection of i.i.d. $\text{Bin}(1, \frac{1}{c_n^2})$ random variables.

Now, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $W(G_{n,\varepsilon})$ be as defined above in (4.2). Then, for any $s \geq 1$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{n \to \infty} |\mathbb{E} T(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon})^s - \mathbb{E} W(G_{n,\varepsilon})^s| = 0,$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. To begin with define $\mathcal{H}_s^{\Delta}$ to be the collection of unlabelled graphs $H = (V(H), E(H))$ formed the union of s triangles. The following lemma bounds the number of copies of H of $G_{n,\varepsilon}$, where $H \in \mathcal{H}_s^{\Delta}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $H \in \mathcal{H}_a^{\Delta} \backslash \mathcal{H}_{a-1}^{\Delta}$, for some $a \geq 1$, and assume that H is connected. Then*

$$N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \lesssim c_n^{|V(H)|-1}. \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover, if $|V(H)| < 2a+1$, then

$$N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \lesssim \varepsilon c_n^{|V(H)|-1}. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Note that since $H \in \mathcal{H}_a^{\Delta} \backslash \mathcal{H}_{a-1}^{\Delta}$ and is connected, it is the union of a labelled triangles which can be ordered as $K_3^{(1)}, K_3^{(2)}, \cdots, K_3^{(a)}$, such that for every $2 \leq t \leq a$, $0 < |V(K_3^{(t)}) \bigcap \bigcup_{s=1}^{t-1} V(K_3^{(s)})| \leq 2$. Now, define

- r_1 as the number of $2 \leq t \leq a$, such that $|V(K_3^{(t)}) \bigcap \bigcup_{s=1}^{t-1} V(K_3^{(s)})| = 2$,
- r_2 be the number of $2 \leq t \leq a$, such that $|V(K_3^{(t)}) \bigcap \bigcup_{s=1}^{t-1} V(K_3^{(s)})| = 1$.

Note that r_1 (respectively r_2) counts the number of times one (respectively two) vertices are added when a new triangle is added, in the sequence which builds the graph H.

Note that $3 + 2r_2 + r_1 = |V(H)|$. Using this along with the bounds $N(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon}) = O(c_n^2)$ (follows from (1.9)) and $\max_{(u,v)\in E(G_{n,\varepsilon})} T(u,v) \leq \varepsilon c_n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}) &\lesssim N(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon})^{r_2+1} \left(\max_{(u,v)\in E(G_{n,\varepsilon})} T(u,v) \right)^{r_1} \\ &\lesssim N(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon})^{\frac{|V(H)|-1-r_1}{2}} \left(\max_{(u,v)\in E(G_{n,\varepsilon})} T(u,v) \right)^{r_1} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{r_1} c_n^{|V(H)|-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.3), since $r_1 \geq 0$.

Finally, if $|V(H)| < 2a+1$, then $r_1 > 0$, (otherwise $|V(H)| = 3 + 2r_2 = 2(r_2+1) + 1 = 2a+1$), and (4.4) follows. □

Now, let Γ the collection of all s ordered triples $(u_1, v_1, w_1), (u_2, v_2, w_2), \ldots, (u_s, v_s, w_s)$, such that (u_a, v_a, w_a) is a triangle in $G_{n,\varepsilon}$. Then by the multinomial expansion (as in the proof of Lemma 2.6),

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}T(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon})^s - \mathbb{E}W(G_{n,\varepsilon})^s| &\leq \sum_{\Gamma} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} \mathbf{1}\{X_{u_a} = X_{v_a} = X_{w_a}\} - \mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} \right| \\ &= \sum_{\Gamma} |\beta(H) - \mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a}| \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where $\beta(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.17) and H is the simple labelled subgraph of $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ obtained by the union of the triangles formed by the triples (u_a, v_a, w_a), for $a \in [s]$.

Next, note that

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} = \left(\frac{1}{c_n^2} \right)^a,$$

if $H \in \mathcal{H}_a^{\Delta} \backslash \mathcal{H}_{a-1}^{\Delta}$, is the union of exactly a triangles. If $H \in \mathcal{H}_a^{\Delta} \backslash \mathcal{H}_{a-1}^{\Delta}$ is connected, then $|V(H)| \leq 2a+1$ and $\mathbb{E} \prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} \leq \frac{1}{c_n^{|V(H)|-1}} = \beta(H)$. Decomposing in to connected components, this

implies that $\mathbb{E}\prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a} \le \beta(H)$, for all $H \in \mathcal{H}_s^{\Delta}$. Moreover, if $|V(H)| = 2a + \nu(H)$, we have $\beta(H) = \mathbb{E}\prod_{a=1}^{s} Z_{u_a v_a w_a}$, and the corresponding term in the RHS of (4.5) is zero. This implies

$$|\mathbb{E}T(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon})^s - \mathbb{E}W(G_{n,\varepsilon})^s| \lesssim \sum_{a=1}^{s} \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{H}_a^{\Delta} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{a-1}^{\Delta} \\ |V(H)| < 2a+\nu(H)}} \frac{N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon})|}{c_n^{|V(H)|-\nu(H)}}, \tag{4.6}$$

Now, fix $H \in \mathcal{H}_a^{\Delta} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{a-1}^{\Delta}$ such that $|V(H)| < 2a + \nu(H)$. Let $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{\nu(H)}$ be the connected components of H. Then, there exists $1 \le t \le \nu(H)$ and $b \ge 1$, such that $|V(H_t)| < 2b + 1$. Therefore,

$$N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \le N(H_t, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \prod_{s \ne t} N(H_s, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \lesssim \varepsilon c_n^{|V(H)|-1},$$

by (4.3) and (4.4).

Therefore, for every $H \in \mathcal{H}_s^{\Delta}$, either $\beta(H) = \omega(H)$ or $N(H, G_{n,\varepsilon})|\beta(H) - \omega(H)| = o(1)$, as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$. This implies that the RHS of (4.6) goes to zero (as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$), since $\mathcal{H}_s^{\Delta}$ is a finite set, completing the proof of (4.1). □

The proof of Theorem 1.5 can now be completed: Since $W(G_{n,\varepsilon})$ is a sum of independent $\text{Ber}(\frac{1}{c_n^2})$ random variables $W(G_{n,\varepsilon}) \to \text{Pois}(\lambda)$, where λ is as defined in (1.9), in distribution and in moments, as $n \to \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \to 0$. Then by Lemma 4.1, $\mathbb{E}(T(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon}))^s \to \mathbb{E}(\text{Pois}(\lambda)^s)$, for any integer $s \ge 1$. As the Poisson distribution is uniquely determined by its moments, this implies, $T(K_3, G_{n,\varepsilon}) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(\lambda)$, and by (4.1), $T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(\lambda)$.

4.2. **Proof of Corollary 1.6.** To begin with note that

$$\mathbb{E}T(K_3, G_n) = \frac{N(K_3, G_n)}{c_n^2}, \quad \text{Var}(T(K_3, G_n)) = N(K_3, G_n)\left(\frac{1}{c_n^2} - \frac{1}{c_n^4}\right) + \Theta\left(\frac{N(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n)}{c_n^3}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{D}_2$ is the two pyramid, or equivalently a 4 cycle with a diagonal. Thus, the given assumptions on the mean and the variance, imply $\frac{N(K_3,G_n)}{c_n^2} \to \lambda$ and $N(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n) = o(c_n^3)$.

To complete the proof, we will invoke Theorem 1.5, and so it suffices to verify (1.9) and (1.10). For checking (1.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{1 \le u < v \le |V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n)\mathbf{1}\{T(u,v) > \varepsilon c_n\} &\le \frac{1}{\binom{\varepsilon c_n}{2}} \sum_{1 \le u < v \le |V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n)\binom{T(u,v)}{2} \\ &\le \frac{1}{\binom{\varepsilon c_n}{2}} N(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n) = o(1),\end{aligned}$$

that is, the truncated 2-pyramid condition (1.10) holds. A similar argument shows that

$$\sum_{1 \le u < v \le |V(G_n)|} a_{uv}(G_n)T(u,v)\mathbf{1}\{T(u,v) > \varepsilon c_n\} = o(c_n^2),$$

which along with the condition $N(K_3, G_n) \sim c_n^2$ gives (1.9). Thus, the corollary follows from Theorem 1.5.

5. Monochromatic Triangles: Examples

In this section we apply Theorem 1.5 to different graph sequences, and determine the specific nature of the limiting distribution. We also construct examples where the limiting distribution of $T(K_3, G_n)$ converges to a non-Poisson limit.



FIGURE 4. Illustration for (a) Example 8 and (b) Example 9.

5.1. **Applications of Theorem 1.5.** We begin by applying Theorem 1.5 to the the Erdős-Rényi random graph.

Example 6. (Random Graphs) Let $G_n \sim G(n, p(n))$ be the Erdős-Rényi random graph. Consider uniformly coloring the graph G_n with c_n colors such that $\frac{n^3p^3}{c_n^2} \to \lambda$. This ensures

$$\mathbb{E}(T(K_3, G_n)) = \frac{1}{c_n^2}\binom{n}{3}p^3 \to \frac{\lambda}{6}.$$

Moreover, $N(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n) = O(n^4p^5) = o(n^{4.5}p^{4.5}) = \Theta(c_n^3)$, for all $p(n)$. Therefore, by Corollary 1.6, $T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(\frac{\lambda}{6})$.

Similarly, for converging sequence of dense graphs, $T(K_3, G_n)$ converges to a Poisson distribution.

Example 7. (Dense Graphs) Let G_n be a sequence of dense graphs on n vertices converging to a graphon W. Consider coloring G_n with c_n colors such that $n^3/c_n^2 \to \lambda$. Then as before $\frac{1}{c_n^2}N(K_3, G_n) \to \frac{\lambda}{6}t(K_3, W)$. Moreover, $N(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n) \le \hom(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n) = O(n^4) = o(c_n^3)$. Therefore, by Corollary 1.6

$$T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}\left(\frac{\lambda}{6}t(K_3, W)\right).$$

(Note that if $t(K_3, W) = 0$, that is, the graph has $o(n^3)$ triangles, then $T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{P} 0$, if $n^3/c_n^2 \to \lambda$. However, $T(K_3, G_n)$ might have a (non-Poisson) limiting distribution in a different scaling, as seen in Example 9 below.)

Note that in both above examples $N(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n) = o(c_n^3)$, and so, Corollary 1.6 can be used to derive the limiting distribution. The following example shows that $T(K_3, G_n)$ can converge to a Poisson distribution, even if $N(\mathcal{D}_2, G_n)/c_n^3$ blows up. In this case we need to use the full strength of Theorem 1.5, thus, illustrating the necessity of the truncation.

Example 8. (Truncation) Let G_n be the graph in Figure 4(a), which consists of a n_1-pyramid with base vertices a and b, and n_2 disjoint triangles, such that $n = n_1 + n_2$. Consider coloring G_n randomly with $c_n = \sqrt{n_2}$ colors. The following cases arise:

- If $n_1 \gtrsim \sqrt{n_2}$, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ small enough, $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ is the graph G_n with edge (a, b) removed, condition (1.9) holds with $\lambda = 1$.
- Otherwise $n_1 \ll \sqrt{n_2}$, in which case $G_{n,\varepsilon}$ is G_n itself, but condition (1.9) still holds with $\lambda = 1$.

Moreover, in both cases it is easy to verify that (1.10) holds, as well. Therefore, by Theorem 1.5,

$$T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(1).$$

This can be verified by directly computation as follows: Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(T(K_3, \mathcal{D}_n) > 0) \le \mathbb{P}(X_a = X_b) = \frac{1}{c_n} \to 0.$$

Moreover, $T(K_3, \bigcup_{s=1}^{n_1} K_3^{(s)}) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(1)$, which implies $T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(1)$, as predicted by Theorem 1.5.

Finally, note that $\mathbb{E}(T(K_3, G_n)) = \frac{1}{c_n^2} N(K_3, G_{n_1}) = \frac{n_1+n_2}{n_2} \ge 1$, with asymptotically strict inequality whenever $n_1 \gtrsim \sqrt{n_2}$. However, $T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(1)$, that is, in this example, $T(K_3, G_n)$ *converges in distribution, but not in moments*, if $n_1 \gtrsim \sqrt{n_2}$. In fact, Theorem 1.5 shows that the mean of the limiting distribution is determined by the number of triangles in the truncated graph $G_{n,\varepsilon}$, not the original graph G_n.

5.2. **Examples of Non-Poisson Limit.** It remains open to characterize the limiting distribution of $T(K_3, G_n)$ beyond the Poisson regime. In fact, set of possible limiting distributions for $T(K_3, G_n)$ is more elaborate than that of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$, as illustrated in the two examples below.

Example 9. (Product of Independent Poissons) Let G_n be the graph in Figure 4(b): It consists of a complete bipartite graph $K_{n,n}$ (with the two partite sets A_n and B_n) and vertex z connected every vertex in $K_{n,n}$. Note that every triangle in G_n passes through z (since $K_{n,n}$ is triangle-free), hence, $N(K_3, G_n) = n^2$. Now, consider coloring G_n randomly with $c_n = n$ colors, such that $N(K_3, G_n)/c_n^2 = 1$. For $a \in [c_n]$, let $L_n(a)$ and $R_n(a)$ be the number of vertices in sets A_n and B_n with color a, respectively. Clearly,

$$L_n(a) \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/c_n) \xrightarrow{D} X, \quad R_n(a) \sim \text{Bin}(n, 1/c_n) \xrightarrow{D} Y,$$

where X and Y are independent Pois(1) variables. Thus, given $z = a$, $T(K_3, G_n) = L_n(a)R_n(a) \xrightarrow{D} XY$, and therefore, unconditionally $T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} XY$, the product of two independent Pois(1) random variables.

We finish by recalling [7, Proposition 8.1] where the authors construct a sequence of graphs G_n such that $T(K_3, G_n)$ converges to a mixture of Poissons.

Example 10. (Mixture of Poissons) For a, b positive integers, define the graph $G_{a,b}$ as follows:

- The vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{a+1}$ form a path P_{a+1} with a edges.

– For every edge $(x_s, x_{s+1}) \in E(P_{a+1})$, there is a b-pyramid $\mathcal{D}_b^{(s)}$, with base (x, y) and vertices $c_1^{(s)}, c_2^{(s)}, \ldots, c_b^{(s)}$.

Figure 5 shows the graph $G_{5,3}$ and its vertex labelings. Note that graph $G_{a,b}$ has $ab+a+1$ vertices, $2ab + a$ edges, and ab triangles.

Let $a = \lambda n$ and $b = n$, that is $N(K_3, G_{a,b}) = \lambda n^2$. Therefore, if we consider a uniform $c_n = n$-coloring of the vertices of $G_{a,b}$, then $\frac{N(K_3,G_n)}{n^2} = \lambda$. It was shown in [7, Proposition 8.1] that in this case

$$T(K_3, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(W), \tag{5.1}$$

where $W \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$, that is, the limiting distribution is a *mixture of Poissons*. The intuition behind this result is as follows: the number of monochromatic edges in the path P_{a+1} is approximately $\text{Pois}(\lambda)$ ([7, Theorem 1.1]), and given an edge (x_s, x_{s+1}) is monochromatic (say color $a \in [c_n]$), then the number of vertices on the pyramid $\mathcal{D}_b^{(s)}$ which have color a is $\text{Bin}(b, \frac{1}{c_n})$, which converges to $\text{Pois}(1)$. Therefore, the limiting distribution of the number of monochromatic triangles is $\sum_{i=1}^{W} X_i$, where $\{X_i\}_{i\geq 1} \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Pois}(1)$ and $W \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ independent of the sequence $\{X_i\}_{i\geq 1}$, giving the mixture in (5.1).



FIGURE 5. Illustration for Example 10: Mixture of Poissons.

6. Conclusion and Open Problems

This paper studies the limiting distribution of the number of monochromatic 2-stars and triangles in a uniformly random coloring of a growing graph sequence. We provide a complete characterization of the limiting distribution of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$, and derive sufficient conditions under which the number of monochromatic triangles $T(K_3, G_n)$ converges to a Poisson distribution.

The results in the paper, in turn, raise many other natural questions. In the following, we discuss some possible future directions:

(1) As mentioned earlier, the number of monochromatic edges $T(K_2, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(\lambda)$, whenever $\mathbb{E}(T(K_2, G_n)) = \frac{|E(G_n)|}{c_n} \xrightarrow{P} \lambda$ [5, 7]. In Corollary 1.4, we show that number of monochromatic 2-stars $T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{D} \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ whenever $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) \to \lambda$ and $\text{Var}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) \to \lambda$, and similarly for the number of monochromatic triangles $T(K_3, G_n)$ (see Corollary 1.6). Does this second-moment phenomenon extend to other monochromatic subgraphs?

(2) Another direction is to understand the limiting distribution of $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ when $\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = \frac{N(K_{1,2},G_n)}{c_n^2}$ grows to infinity. For the case of monochromatic edges, [7, Theorem 1.2] showed that

$$Z(K_2, G_n) := \frac{T(K_2, G_n) - \mathbb{E}(T(K_2, G_n))}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(T(K_2, G_n))}} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1),$$

whenever $\mathbb{E}(T(K_2, G_n)) = \frac{|E(G_n)|}{c_n} \to \infty$ such that $c_n \to \infty$. Error rates for the above CLT were obtained by Fang [19]. It is natural to wonder whether this universality phenomenon extends to monochromatic 2-stars, and more generally, to any fixed connected graph H, that is,

$$Z(H, G_n) := \frac{T(H, G_n) - \mathbb{E}(T(H, G_n))}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(T(H, G_n))}} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1),$$

whenever $\mathbb{E}(T(H, G_n)) = \frac{|N(H,G_n)|}{c_n^{|V(H)|-1}} \to \infty$ such that $c_n \to \infty$.

(3) The situation is quite different when $\mathbb{E}(T(H, G_n)) = \frac{|N(H,G_n)|}{c_n^{|V(H)|-1}} \to \infty$ such that $c_n = c$ is fixed. In fact, when $H = K_2$, [7, Theorem 1.3] showed that $Z(K_2, G_n)$ is asymptotically normal if and only if $\mathbb{E}(Z(K_2, G_n)^4) \to 3$ [7, Theorem 1.3]. It would be interesting to explore whether this fourth-moment phenomenon extends to general graphs H as well.

Acknowledgement: The authors are indebted to Somabha Mukherjee for his careful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. The authors also thank Swastik Kopparty for explaining to them the entropic counting technique [24].

References

[1] N. I. Akhiezer, *The Classical Problem of Moments and Some Related Questions of Analysis*, Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, 1965.
[2] N. Alon, On the number of subgraphs of prescribed type of graphs with a given number of edges, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, Vol. 38, 116–130, 1981.
[3] N. Alon, On the number of certain subgraphs contained in graphs with a given number of edges, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, Vol. 53, 97–120, 1986.
[4] R. Arratia, L. Goldstein, and L. Gordon, Poisson approximation and the Chen-Stein method, *Statistical Science*, Vol. 5 (4), 403–424, 1990.
[5] A. D. Barbour, L. Holst, L. and S. Janson, *Poisson Approximations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992.
[6] A. Basak and S. Mukherjee, Universality of the mean-field for the Potts model, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, to appear, 2017.
[7] B. B. Bhattacharya, P. Diaconis, S. Mukherjee, Universal Poisson and Normal limit theorems in graph coloring problems with connections to extremal combinatorics, *Annals of Applied Probability*, Vol. 27 (1), 337–394, 2017.
[8] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós, and K. Vesztergombi, Convergent sequences of dense graphs I: Subgraph frequencies, metric properties and testing, *Advances in Mathematics*, Vol. 219, 1801–1851, 2009.
[9] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós, and K. Vesztergombi, Convergent sequences of dense graphs II. Multiway cuts and statistical physics, *Annals of Mathematics*, Vol. 176, 151–219, 2012.
[10] A. Cerquetti and S. Fortini, A Poisson approximation for colored graphs under exchangeability, *Sankhya: The Indian Journal of Statistics* Vol. 68(2), 183–197, 2006.
[11] S. Chatterjee and P. Diaconis, Estimating and understanding exponential random graph models, *The Annals of Statistics*, Vol. 41 (5), 2428–2461, 2013.
[12] S. Chatterjee, P. Diaconis, and E. Meckes, Exchangeable pairs and Poisson approximation, *Electron. Encyclopedia Probab.*, 2004.
[13] A. DasGupta, The matching, birthday and the strong birthday problem: a contemporary review, *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, Vol. 130, 377–389, 2005.
[14] P. Diaconis and S. Holmes, A Bayesian peek into Feller I, *Sankhya, Series A*, Vol. 64 (3), 820–841, 2002.

[15] P. Diaconis and F. Mosteller, Methods for studying coincidences, *The Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 84(408), 853–861, 1989.
[16] F. M Dong, K. M. Koh, and K. L. Teo, *Chromatic polynomials and chromaticity of graphs*, World Scientific Publishing Company, 2005.
[17] P. Erdős, On the number of complete subgraphs contained in certain graphs, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hungar. Acad. Sci.*, Vol. 7, 459-464, 1962.
[18] S. Fadnavis, A note on the shameful conjecture, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, Vol. 47, 115–122, 2015.
[19] X. Fang, A universal error bound in the CLT for counting monochromatic edges in uniformly colored graphs, *Electronic Communications in Probability*, Vol, 20, Article 21, 1–6, 2015.
[20] E. Friedgut and J. Kahn, On the number of copies of one hypergraph in another, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, Vol. 105 (1), 251–256, 1998.
[21] J. H. Friedman and L. C. Rafsky, Multivariate generalizations of the Wolfowitz and Smirnov two-sample tests, *Annals of Statistics*, Vol. 7, 697–717, 1979.
[22] T. R. Jensen and B. Toft, *Graph Coloring Problems*, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, 1995.
[23] T. R. Jensen and B. Toft, Unsolved Graph Coloring Problems, *manuscript in preparation*, 2013.
[24] S. Kopparty and B. Rossman, The homomorphism domination exponent, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, Vzol. 32 (7), 1097–1114, 2011.
[25] M. Krivelevich and B. Sudakov, The largest eigenvalue of sparse random graph, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, Vol. 12 (1), 61–72, 2003.
[26] L. Lovász, *Large Networks and Graph Limits*, Colloquium Publications, Vol. 60, 2012.
[27] M. Nandi and D. R. Stinson, Multicollision attacks on some generalized sequential hash functions, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Vol. 53 (2), 759–767, 2007.
[28] I. Nourdin, G. Peccati and G. Reinert, Stein's method and stochastic analysis of Rademacher sequences, *Electronic Journal of Probabability*, Vol. 15 (55), 1703–1742, 2010.
[29] I. Nourdin, G. Peccati and G. Reinert, Invariance principles for homogeneous sums: universality of Gaussian Wiener chaos, *Annals of Probability*, Vol. 38 (5), 1947–1985, 2010.
[30] I. Nourdin, G. Peccati, G. Poly and R. Simone, Classical and free fourth moment theorems: universality and thresholds, *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, Vol. 29 (2), 653–680, 2016.
[31] R. P. Stanley, A symmetric function generalization of the chromatic polynomial of a graph, *Advances in Mathematics*, Vol. 111 (1), 166–194, 1995.

Appendix A. Technical Lemmas

In this section, we collect the proofs of the general technical lemmas which were used in the proofs of the main theorems.

A.1. **Proof of Proposition 1.1.** If $\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \to 0$, then $\mathbb{P}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n) > 0) \leq \mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \to 0$.

To show that $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)$ diverges, if $\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \to \infty$, it suffices to show that $\mathrm{Var}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) = o((\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n))^2)$, because this implies that $T(K_{1,2}, G_n)/\mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) \xrightarrow{P} 1$, which is possible only if $T(K_{1,2}, G_n) \xrightarrow{P} \infty$.

From (2.33) and (2.34) and using $N(C_4, G_n) \lesssim N(P_4, G_n)$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) &\lesssim \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}{c_n^2} + \frac{N(K_{1,3}, G_n)}{c_n^3} + \frac{N(P_4, G_n)}{c_n^3} \\
&\lesssim \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)}{c_n^2} + \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{3/2}}{c_n^3} + \frac{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{4/3}}{c_n^3} \qquad \text{(A.1)} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n)) + \mathbb{E}(T(K_{1,2}, G_n))^{3/2} \\
&= o((\mathbb{E}T(K_{1,2}, G_n))^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where (A.1) uses the estimates: $N(P_4, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{4/3}$ (by Lemma 2.7) and $N(K_{1,3}, G_n) \lesssim N(K_{1,2}, G_n)^{3/2}$. This bound follows on noting that

$$N(K_{1,3}, G_n) = \sum_{v \in V(G_n)} \binom{d_v(G_n)}{3} \leq \frac{\max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v(G_n)}{3} N(K_{1,2}, G_n),$$

along with the observation $\max_{v \in V(G_n)} d_v(G_n) = O(\sqrt{N(K_{1,2}, G_n)})$.

A.2. **Verifying the Stieltjes Moment Condition.** Recall that a *non-negative* random variable Z is uniquely determined by its moments if it satisfies the *Stieltjes moment condition* [1], if $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(Z^s)^{-\frac{1}{2s}} = \infty$. In this section we show that the limiting random variable (1.7) satisfies the Stieltjes moment condition, which together with the arguments in Section 2.7, completes the proof of Theorem 1.7.

The following observation condition gives a simple sufficient condition for the Stieltjes moment condition.

Observation A.1. *If a random variable Z satisfies $\mathbb{E}(e^{t\sqrt{Z}}) < \infty$, for some $t > 0$, then the Stieltjes moment condition holds.*

Proof. Let $C := \mathbb{E}(e^{t\sqrt{Z}}) < \infty$. Then, for each $s \geq 1$, $\frac{t^{2s}\mathbb{E}Z^s}{(2s)!} \leq C$, that is, $\mathbb{E}Z^s \leq \frac{C(2s)!}{t^{2s}}$. Therefore, using $s! \leq s^s$

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(Z^s)^{\frac{1}{2s}}} \geq \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{t}{C^{\frac{1}{2s}}((2s)!)^{\frac{1}{2s}}} \gtrsim t \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s} = \infty,$$

since $C^{\frac{1}{2s}} \to 1$, as $s \to \infty$. □

Therefore, to show that the limiting random variable (1.7) satisfies the Stieltjes moment condition it suffices to show the following proposition:

Proposition A.1. *The random variable $Z := \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \binom{R_v}{2} + 3Q_1 + Q_2$, as defined in (1.7) satisfies $\mathbb{E}(e^{t\sqrt{Z}}) < \infty$, for all $t > 0$, that is, the Stieltjes moment condition holds.*

Proof. Using the inequality $\sqrt{a+b+c} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b} + \sqrt{c}$, for $a, b, c \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{t\sqrt{Z}}) \leq \mathbb{E}e^{t\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} R_v(R_v-1)}} + \mathbb{E}e^{t\sqrt{3Q_1}} + \mathbb{E}e^{t\sqrt{Q_2}}.$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}e^{t\sqrt{3Q_1}} < \mathbb{E}e^{3tQ_1}$, for all $t > 0$, since Q_1 has a Poisson distribution. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}e^{t\sqrt{Q_2}} < \mathbb{E}e^{tQ_2}$, for all $t > 0$. Therefore, to prove the result, it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{E}e^{t\sqrt{\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} R_v(R_v-1)}} < \infty, \tag{A.2}$$

for all $t > 0$.

Now, for any $t > 0$, since $R_1, R_2, \ldots,$ are independent $\text{Pois}(\theta_1), \text{Pois}(\theta_2), \ldots$, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}e^{t\sqrt{\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} R_v(R_v-1)}} &= \prod_{v=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}e^{t\sqrt{R_v(R_v-1)}} \\
&= \prod_{v=1}^{\infty} e^{-\theta_v} \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} e^{t\sqrt{r(r-1)}} \frac{\theta_v^r}{r!} \\
&\leq \prod_{v=1}^{\infty} e^{-\theta_v} \Big(1 + \theta_v + \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \frac{e^{tr}\theta_v^r}{r!}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \prod_{v=1}^{\infty} e^{-\theta_v} \Big(\theta_v + e^{e^t \theta_v} - e^t \theta_v \Big). \tag{A.3}$$

Let $s := e^t$, and note that there exists K such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough

$$\sup_{x \in [0,\varepsilon)} \frac{-x + \log\Big(x + e^{sx} - sx\Big)}{x^2} = K < \infty, \tag{A.4}$$

since, by the L'Hospital's rule, $\lim_{x \to 0} \frac{1}{x^2} \Big\{ -x + \log\Big(x + e^{sx} - sx\Big) \Big\} < \infty$.

Next, by Fatou's lemma, $C := \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \theta_v^2 \le \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{c_n^2} \sum_{v=1}^{|V(G_n)|} d_v^2 \lesssim \lambda < \infty$. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $|\{v : \theta_v \ge \varepsilon\}| \le \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{v : \theta_v \ge \varepsilon} \theta_v^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}$. Therefore, taking logarithm on both sides of (A.3) and using (A.4), there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathbb{E} e^{t \sqrt{\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} R_v (R_v - 1)}} &\le \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \Big\{ -\theta_v + \log\Big(\theta_v + e^{s\theta_v} - s\theta_v\Big) \Big\} \\
&\le M(\varepsilon) + \sum_{v : \theta_v < \varepsilon} \Big\{ -\theta_v + \log\Big(\theta_v + e^{e^{t'} \theta_v} - e^{t'} \theta_v\Big) \Big\} \\
&\le M(\varepsilon) + K \sum_{v : \theta_v < \varepsilon} \theta_v^2 < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of (A.2) and the proposition. □

Department of Statistics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA, bhaswar@wharton.upenn.edu

Department of Statistics, Columbia University, New York, USA, sm3949@columbia.edu